

BAP

W5766a

v. 2

copy 1

80 cts A

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

SCB
10439

William Dand

Esq. Librarian

anno Domini

1784

4 1/2

Infant-Baptism

FROM

HEAVEN and not of MEN:

OR AN

ANSWER

TO

Mr DANVERS his Treatise
of BAPTISM.

Wherein, as the Vanity of his Authorities
are, though briefly, yet sufficiently detected;
so his Doctrinal Part is especially examined and
confuted, and Infants Right to Baptism further
confirmed.

By J. Whiston, Minister of the Gospel.

*The lip of truth shall be established for ever, but the lying
tongue is but for a moment. Prov. 12. 19.*

*In fœdere divino cum Abrahamo inito substantia et veritas
constans est et immutabilis, Junius.*

LONDON,

Printed for, and sold by Jonathan Robinson, at the
Golden Lyon in S. Pauls Church-yard. 1675.

1700

1700

1700

1700

1700

1700

1700

1700

1700

1700

1700

1700

1700

1700

1700

CHRISTIAN READER.

N Either the writing nor reading of Controversies (supposing the subject weighty and important) would be without their pleasure or profit, were they managed as they ought to be. The understanding of man finds somewhat of pleasure even in searching after, much more in discovering truth, of what kind soever it be. And that which adds not a little to the pleasure and delight of a sincere Christian in searching after and finding out divine truth, is, as a consciousness to himself of discharging his duty in the search he makes after it, so the great love he bears to it, and consequently the acceptableness of it to him when found out. And for disputable doctrines or practices to be thoroughly ventilated and sifted, that the utmost of what may be said either for or against them may be brought to light, is not a little profitable; it highly conducing to the conscientious embracement or rejection of them, as also the peace and satisfaction of the mind, as having embraced or rejected according to the evidence appearing on the one or the other hand. But when men shall rise up either in defence of, or opposition to any controverted doctrine or practice, and manage their undertaking only with naked repetitions of Scriptures, reasons, or objections that have been already sifted to the bran, and answered again and again, with the alone addition of some ungrounded dictates, illogical deductions; forgeries, or the like of their own, as it is matter of wonder, what content such men can take in writing, so no pleasure or emolument can arise unto Readers: But on the other hand as such men must needs expose themselves to contempt and scorn, so the issue of their writings will be the further exasperations of mens spirits, and the disquietment of their consciences, who having been unwarily proselyted, do at last come to discover the cheat that hath been put upon them. As for Infant-baptism, though to me it is

The Epistle

καυχήδον, yet it must be reckoned among καυχήδον *Theologiae*. Neither shall I be so uncharitable as to impute all the scruples that may arise in the minds of men about it, to ignorance or perverseness, nor will I brand all enquirers about it as πυνθόμενοι τῷ ἀκούῃ as the Apostle speaks of some, 2 *Tim.* 4. 3. Nor yet should a rational logical discourse, (such as I deny not some of Mr. *Tombes* his former writings have been) in the examination of the chief grounds laid for it (provided the scripture be allowed the place *supremi judicis*) be at all offensive, but greatly welcome unto me. But as for that tract of Mr. *Danvers* here examined, and some dictates of Mr. *Tombes* of later date, they are in the highest degree nauseous, and can return to no good account either to Writers or Readers. As for this Tract of Mr. *Danvers*, I can say no less of it, than that it is a meer cheat, neither can I well think himself can in his most serious thoughts pass any other censure upon it. I have often thought (supposing him a man under any sense of a future account) he must needs have that of the Apostle in his mind during the whole composition of it, *I have caught you with guile*. The utmost that he could rationally promise to himself, was, that he possibly might beguile some unwary Readers into a compliance with what himself had imbibed, under the notion of an important truth. How he could imagine that his attempts should prove successful with any men of a competent understanding I cannot see? Seeing his book carries along with it a sufficient antidote against its own embracement by such Readers. Could he think that his Authority should be regarded by any man that attends to what he reads, or hath so much use of his own reason, as to compare what he finds in one page, with what he finds in another, when some of his own Authors so evidently contradict what others of them, and those *multis nominibus* less regardable do affirm; will any man of an ordinary understanding, who lies not under the force of his own prejudices and præin-gagements believe that *Boetius*, *Willisfrid Strabo*, or any other contemporary, with, or consequent unto them, could better know what the primitive practice was, than

• *Austin*

To the Reader.

Austin or *Chrysostom*, who lived so many hundred years nearer those times than they did? Will any man entertain the least supposition that Pope *Innocent* was the inventor or the institutor of Infant-baptism, when such credible and unquestionable Authors as these shall in express terms affirm it was in his days the universal practice of the whole Church, yea had been so time out of mind? As for the argumentative part of his book, alas! how little more, yea how much less hath he said, than what others have said before him? Who may not say, who knows not such things as these? As for what he hath added of his own, it cannot well but be interpreted no less than an impeachment of the understandings of all men, so much as to offer any assistance to discover the weakness and fallaciousness of it: And his book carrying such apparent preservatives against its own reception, no wonder though it meet with no sooner a reply. Alas! who could imagine that it needed any? For my own part, it cost me not a few thoughts to determine with my self what should be the Authors design in it. Sometimes I was ready to think he was no friend to the Anabaptists, but designed only to cast a slur upon their cause: Sometimes I was ready to think he only designed to gain to himself the repute of a man of great reading, and that the argumentative part was only to make way to the publication of those variety of collections he had heaped up. And other thoughts I had, but at last hearing more of him; (for he is wholly unknown to me by face) charity obligeth me to hope he is one of those the Apostle speaks of, who building upon *that good foundation the Lord Jesus Christ*, though it be *wood, hay, and stubble*, yet themselves *shall be saved. yet so as by fire with the loss of their works*. I hope he hath at least an habitual love for our Lord Christ, and verily judgeth the promotion of the cause he is engaged in would be acceptable service to him, since he hath managed his whole undertaking so, as he conceiv'd it might prove successful among at least persons of weaker judgments.

I remember not long since one of the same persuasion with our Author having put forth a small tract in pursu-

The Epistle

ance of the same design, I hapned to meet him at a friend-house in *Wapping*, whither he had brought some of his books to be dispersed among the men of his own persuasion. I cast my eye upon one of them, and presently discerning the fallacy. I askt him whether he knew of no weightier objections that might be raised against his assertions than what he had there taken notice of? His reply was, he hoped that what he had done might do some good. So I suppose Mr. *Danvers*, though he could not hope that any persons of learning or judgement would be moved by what he had written, yet he hoped that his pains might do some good according to his account of good. But alas! such petty designs will in the close only prove destructive to the cause, the supportation of which is attempted by them; when any opinions or practices appear evidently to be only supported by fraud and guile, or that which is worse, however those that are praëingaged may be backward to relinquish them; yet all that are disingaged must needs be greatly prejudiced, as against the opinions and practices themselves, so against the promoters of them. It hath been (as I have elsewhere intimated) no little wonder to me, whence it should come to pass that Christians, and those too, at least some of them men of learning and judgment, should so tenaciously maintain an opinion lying in such a direct opposition to their childrens good as well as their own comfort, and can satisfie themselves with such pityful nonsensical evasions and petty reasonings, yea will rather run themselves upon the greatest absurdities, than submit to the plainest demonstrations. And after much revolving the matter in my mind, I cannot but assign the cause hereof, as to the things there mentioned, so to their praëingagements, and in special to the want of a clear understanding in the Covenant of Grace, both in respect of the good granted, and conveyed thereby to the Infant-seed of believers, and the true tenour thereof, as extended to and made with them: And pardon me though I say I cannot but think not only Antipædobaptists, but even Pædobaptists themselves, yea and that some of the most learned among them, have been greatly wanting here-
in :

in : Hence are those expressions, in the writings of Pædo-baptists, of an outward Covenant, a Covenant of privileges and the like, phrases greatly obstructing the reception of the truth they have done worthily in the defence of. From the same cause in the general, it is that our opposers talk of a Covenant with the elect, and of that grand promise of Gods being a God to people, implying and necessarily including all that good whether relative or positive contained in all the promises of the Covenant. Were the primitive doctrine of the Covenant revived, I should not much question but all men of judgment and conscience would soon center in the primitive practice of Infant-baptism, some essays of that nature shall *owen* *den* shortly be made publick. This I would only say at present, that the Covenant taking it in a proper sence, as (implying a stipulation on Gods part, and a restipulation on mans) is so far from being restrained to the elect, that it is not made with any one of the Elect, *quâ* Elect. Election is unto eternal life, to the attaining of which they are predestinated to a Covenant-state, neither are any *Abrahams* seed meerly as elected. Hence were it evident that this or that particular person, whether Infant or Adult were elect, yet could he not be duly baptized on that account. It is Covenant-interest not Election that gave a right of Circumcision of old, and gives a right to Baptism still: Were but the Covenant rightly understood, this controversie about Infant-baptism would have vastly less difficulty in it. Its true tis a controversie of long agitation, which renders the gaining satisfaction about it more difficult, and cannot ordinarily be attained to without some considerable pains and diligence, as well as a freedom from all prepossessions and preingagements. But will any serious enquirers willing to take what pains and use what diligence is necessary in such a case (suspending for the present their judgment about the good and benefit that the seed of believers have by virtue of their Covenant-interest . and membership in the Church, and answerably waving the interpretations put upon the promises appertaining unto them, with the deductions drawn

The Epistle

therefrom) throughly weigh, and faithfully compare what is written on both sides, in special by Mr. *Danvers* and Mr. *Tombes*, including his late letter to Mr. *Danvers*, on the one side, and by Mr. *Baxter* taking in the ensuing papers, and that small treatise often referred to in them, on the other, as I doubt not but they will be sufficiently furnished with light to proceed by; so I shall freely leave the controversie to their determination and doubt not but that though they may not at present see what is the proper Benefit Infants have by their Covenant-interest, Church-membership and Baptism, nor apprehend how the one or the other can be granted to them without some inconveniēces ensuing, yet will be clearly convinced that both the one and the other must be granted to them; and answerably when they come to see the true tenour of the Covenant stated, and those inconveniences feared, obviated, they will be abundantly satisfied in the determination they have made. And therefore though I had sometimes thought to have made some animadversions upon that late letter of Mr. *Tombes* to Mr. *Danvers*; yet I shall wave it, not doubting but the Reader will find what is material in it sufficiently obviated in the ensuing papers, taken in conjunction with the treatise referred to. It is true Mr. *Danvers* hath found out a new or rather reviv'd an old device, and that is, that however consequences may be drawn, and inferences made in other cases, yet in the worship of God nothing as worship is to be admitted without some plain and expresse word, either by precept or example, to warrant the same: And this he saith (though according to his intendment most falsely and disingeniously) is a known agreed rule among Protestants, and cites according to his usual manner several Authors for it. To which I would say in the words of a late worthy Author, that it must be a desperate cause that cannot otherwise be maintained, viz. than by denying scripture-consequences. And let me only ask Mr. *Danvers* whether the observation of the Lords day be a part of divine worship, at least be not acknowledged so to be by the generality of Protestants, and in special by those Authors he cites, and whether there be any

any such exprefs precept or example as he requires to warrant the fame, though there is enough in fcripture to prove that it ought to be obferved which fufficiently fhews his miftake of thefe Authors. They undoubtedly take confequences rightly and duly drawn equivalent to exprefs precept and example. And let me fay, will he not allow found confequences in matters of worfhip, he will leave but little worfhip to be performed by the Church, and himfelf muft reject fome parts of worfhip, which yet I hope he owns and walks in the practice of. But men that are refolved to maintain their opinions, muft fay fomething that may look like reafon in the eyes of byaffed or weak men, how unreafonable and abfurd foever it be in the judgment of others. And yet further, let it be obferved that whereas our oppofers take it for granted and perfwade people that we have only confequences to ground our judgment and practice upon, the truth is, we have efpecially for what we mainly contend for, *viz.* the Covenant-intereft, and Church-membership of the feed of believers, the plain and exprefs letter of the Scriptures, and they have only confequences to oppofe us withal. The words are as exprefs as words can be. *I will be thy God, and the God of thy feed in their generations.* Now take this promife as firftly made to *Abraham* himfelf, and according to the letter of it, it muft needs intend his natural feed immediately proceeding from his own loins. And the *Apoftle* in exprefs words tells us that the bleffing of *Abraham* is come upon believing Gentiles. Or take the promife according to the full latitude of it as including his fpiritual feed, yet to exclude his natural is contrary to the very letter of the promife, 2. take it as made to his feed, fo it is to them in their Generations, which according to the letter muft include their feed with them. So the *Apoftle* tells thofe awakened Jews, the promife was to them and their Children. *Paul* tells the *Corinthians* in exprefs words their Children were holy, yet once again, the *Apoftle* affures the *Jaylor*, that he believing, not only himfelf but his houfe fhould be faved. Which promife I fuppofe our oppofers themfelves will grant is applicable to all in his

his case, and answerably according to the very letter takes in their Infant-seed supposing them to have any such. Here are no consequences but the plain and express words of Scripture, and our opposers have only consequences by which they endeavour to prove that these scriptures are not to be understood according to the letter, but must have another sence and meaning put upon them: Hence would our opposers yield to the very letter of the scriptures, and grant the promises of the Covenant do appertain to the seed of believers, and only suspend their Baptism, our differences would be very much healed. And yet further, let me say we want very little of the express letter of the scripture for their Baptism. It is according to the express letter of the scripture, that *Abrahams* seed in their Generations (which I have said must according to the letter include Parents and Children) should keep the Covenant, that is the token of the Covenant, and what other token there now is that can possibly be understood in this command to be kept by *Abrahams* seed, that is by believers in their generations, excepting Baptism, cannot be shewed. So according to the letter of the Scripture, interest in the promise is a sufficient ground for Baptism. *Repent and be baptized, for the promise is to you.* So that would but our opposers lay aside consequences and yield to the letter of the Scripture, our contentions would be, if not wholly at an end, yet greatly abated, we shall infallibly have what we mainly contend for, and a fair ground will be layd for our practice. And from what hath been said, it evidently appears our opposers are equally concerned in consequences with our selves, and answerably such pleas must be look'd upon but as mere pretences to screen off that light they are unwilling to submit unto. And indeed as the whole design of our Author, so many passages in Mr. Tombes his latter writings sufficiently evidence they are now reduced to meer artifices and shifts for the supportation of the cause they have unadvisedly engaged in. As an evidence hereof take an instance or two. Whereas our Author had said, the *Magdeburgenses* tell us, that in the first Century, they find they [only] baptized the Adult,
and

and being charged by Mr. *Wills* with the falsification of those Authors, and accused by some ministers of immorality, as well he might, let us see how in his reply to Mr. *Wills* he comes off. And to let pass his first answer, which only concerns Mr. *Wills*, his second is this, *viz.* that these words in his book are not his translation of their words, but his own sense upon them. But

First, I would appeal to Mr. *Danvers* his own conscience, whether he would not have had his Reader, and to all Readers, whether they did not understand them as their very words? His words are express, they tell us. Now who could imagine that Mr. *Danvers* his meaning was only this, that so much might be inferred from their words. But granting him this, I would then appeal to him whether he did not design to put a cheat upon his Readers? For I would ask him as he will answer it at the bar of Jesus Christ, whether he was not willing that his Reader should, and did expect that he would believe that these *Magdeburgenses* had affirmed, at least granted somewhat more in favour of his cause, than what is the universal grant of all Pedobaptists? otherwise what a frivolous thing was it for him to bring them in as witnesses for him, But

Secondly, No such sense or interpretation can with any shew of Reason be put upon them, for they are very confident none more, that not only the Adult, but also Infants were baptized in that age, grounding that their confidence partly upon the Scriptures themselves, and partly upon the testimonies of those Fathers that lived near those times, Now when they make only such a grant as is made by all Pedobaptists, *viz.* that no express Example is left upon record of any Infants being baptized, yet expressing the highest confidence that they were baptized, withal declaring the ground they had both from scripture and humane Authority for that their confidence, can any rational man interpret them as saying they find they baptized only the Adult, when they assure us they find the quite contrary, that they baptized Infants as well as the Adult.

Again, Whereas he had so disingeniously said that
Tradition

The Epistle

Tradition was the principal ground laid for Infant baptism, and Mr. *Wills* had charged him with immodesty, see how he comes off in his reply? Why it is by proceeding from immodesty to impudence. For

First, He would persuade his Reader, that there is little or no difference between the sense in which Protestants and Papists use the term Tradition, which is notoriously false, taking it of Tradition in the general; though it is true, the Papists speaking of Infant-baptism sometimes contradict themselves, affirming that it may be plainly enough gathered out of the Scriptures, which is inconsistent with their notion of Tradition.

Secondly, He would persuade his Reader, that take away Tradition, the doctrine and practice of Infant-baptism (according to our own concessions) would fall to the ground, when he cannot but know that most, if not universally all the chief assertors of Infant-baptism affirm, it may be proved alone from the Scriptures, though the doctrine and practice of the Church were utterly unknown. And if such men are not put to their shifts, I know not who are. The like may be seen in Mr. *Tombes*. Hence is that absurd notion invented of the seed of the Jews being Church-members meerly by a fact of divine providence. Hence he seems to design the scaring his Reader into a compliance with his notions: Hence are those big words speaking of Mr. *Baxters* book of Baptism, saith he, that accursed book, and why is it accursed? but because Mr. *Tombes* nor any others of his party can answer it. So speaking of the epistle of *Cyprian* to *Fidus*, tis saith he an absurd Epistle, when he knows, be it as absurd as it will (though so absurd as he pretends it is not) so long as it is genuine, and not forged (which he cannot say it is) it sufficiently serves our purpose, fully declaring that the primitive practice was for Infant-baptism.

Yet once again, with him to affirm that *Ishmael* was in Covenant, is in express words to gainsay the Apostle. And why so? Because the Apostle tells us he was cast out (*Gal. 4.*) that is out of the Covenant as hath been proved. Now to say he was ever in Covenant, because the Apostle

saith

faith he was after cast out of it, is with Mr. *Tombes* to gainsay the Apostle; and variety of like instances might be given. Now surely such things shew, men are reduced to their shifts, they see their cause would utterly fall, should it not be supported by such artifices and shifts. But I must hasten.

Reader. Thou mayst easily perceive, I have not been very forward to engage in this controversie. Thou wilt still find me in the rear: I am aware what discouragements attend such undertakings, saith *Austin*, *Bella quantumvis justa attamen hominibus molesta et tristia videntur, nam inter alia qua refugit humanum ingenium, videbunt adversaria partis iniquitatem propter quam coguntur pugnare, nec de ea non poterunt non dolere*, which is too evidently verified in our present contests. Hence a man can hardly appear against any error, but he will seem to be an enemy as well to the persons holding, as to the errors held by them. It must be said, so ill hath our present Author managed his undertaking- that it is hard, if possible, to detect his mistakes. but his miscarriages will be also detected. And how his Antagonist shall be treated by him may be too plainly guessed at, by the ill manner of his managing his cause. *Solomon* indeed tells us, *that he that passeth by, and medleth with strife, that belongeth not to him, taketh a dog by the ears*. But be the Issue what it will, this will be my comfort, I have not medled with a strife, that belongs not to me. I am set for the defence of the Gospel, I had more than a single call to this work. I see not how I could have held my peace, without making a breach upon my peace. And if any shall say I need not have interposed, others have said enough, I answer, we account not the bringing water to quench fire got into the thatch superfluous, so long as there is water enough to be brought and the fire is not thoroughly quenched.

Others have done well, yet something more may be added. I must profess, I am so far from judging that all is said, that can be said for the clearing up and establishing the practice contended for, that though I will not say little is said in comparison of what may be; yet I am very confident,

The Epistle

confident, much may be said beyond what is. As for the ensuing papers, they principally concern the doctrinal part of Mr. *Danvers* his book, and hence I have kept to his first edition, understanding that no material alteration is made in his second. What I have done is submitted to the judgment of all unbiassed and intelligent Readers. Others have said enough to discover the forgery and vanity of his Authorities, yet they are not wholly passed by. I know all could not buy all books that are written, and this may fall into the hands of some, into whose hands those others may not come. And besides, possibly some will be at a loss not knowing whom to credit being themselves unable to search Authors, here they may see Mr. *Danvers* his witnesses contradicting and confuting one another, and will but men seriously weigh his book, and compare his Authorities one with another, I doubt not they will find themselves sufficiently armed against all pretences, that either himself or any others may make of having humane authority on their side. For

First, They will evidently see his forgeries, and that designedly to deceive his unwary Reader, hence as they are sufficiently warned to take heed how to credit any thing himself hath said or may say, so they have ground to be wary how they credit any of his persuasion in what ever pretences they may make of this nature.

Secondly, They will see that upon the utmost enquiry that can be made into antiquity (for such an enquiry it may be supposed Mr. *Danvers* hath made) but only one, viz. poor *Tertullian* and he greatly abused too, can be pretended to have been against Infant-baptism for three hundred years after Christ. Mr. *Danvers* pretends to no more.

Thirdly, They will have the testimony of two of the most credible Authors that ever wrote, viz. *Chrysostom* and *Austin*, that before the year four hundred (for *Chrysostom* died in the year four hundred and five, and *Austin* in the year Four Hundred and Thirty) Infant baptism was the universal practice of the Church, yea had been so for ought what then appeared in any record from the Apostles

To the Reader.

poftles days. And they that will after this be deceived by any pretence of humane Authority they muft thank themfelves, they have Mr. *Danvers* his book to rife up in judgment againft them.

Ibine in the Service of the Gospel.

J. W.

The Epistle

confident, much may be said beyond what is. As for the ensuing papers, they principally concern the doctrinal part of Mr. *Danvers* his book, and hence I have kept to his first edition, understanding that no material alteration is made in his second. What I have done is submitted to the judgment of all unbiassed and intelligent Readers. Others have said enough to discover the forgery and vanity of his Authorities, yet they are not wholly passed by. I know all could not buy all books that are written, and this may fall into the hands of some, into whose hands those others may not come. And besides, possibly some will be at a loss not knowing whom to credit being themselves unable to search Authors, here they may see Mr. *Danvers* his witnesses contradicting and confuting one another, and will but men seriously weigh his book, and compare his Authorities one with another, I doubt not they will find themselves sufficiently armed against all pretences, that either himself or any others may make of having humane authority on their side. For

First, They will evidently see his forgeries, and that designedly to deceive his unwary Reader, hence as they are sufficiently warned to take heed how to credit any thing himself hath said or may say, so they have ground to be wary how they credit any of his persuasion in what ever pretences they may make of this nature.

Secondly, They will see that upon the utmost enquiry that can be made into antiquity (for such an enquiry it may be supposed Mr. *Danvers* hath made) but only one, viz. poor *Tertullian* and he greatly abused too, can be pretended to have been against Infant-baptism for three hundred years after Christ. Mr. *Danvers* pretends to no more.

Thirdly, They will have the testimony of two of the most credible Authors that ever wrote, viz. *Chrysostom* and *Austin*, that before the year four hundred (for *Chrysostom* died in the year four hundred and five, and *Austin* in the year Four Hundred and Thirty) Infant baptism was the universal practice of the Church, yea had been so for ought what then appeared in any record from the Apostles

To the Reader.

postles days. And they that will after this be deceived by any pretence of humane Authority they must thank themselves, they have Mr. *Danvers* his book to rise up in judgment against them.



Thine in the service of the Gospel.

J. W.

ERRATA.


READER, by reason of the Authors absence from the press, many Erratas are escaped, the most material (some of which pervert the sense) are here noted, the lesser are left to thy ingenuity to correct or pardon.

Page 2. line 5: read *bence*. p. 7. l. 29. r. *cite*. p. 12. l. 3. r. *thirdly*. p. 32. l. 32. r. *during*. p. 48. l. 10. r. *less heed*. p. 49. l. 13. r. *raze*. p. 50. l. 29. r. *opposed*. p. 51. l. 2. after *that they are* add *not*. p. 64. l. 18. r. 66. p. 65. in the marg. r. *scripturæ*. p. 68. l. 9. r. *by*. p. 71. in the contents r. *particulars*. p. 77. l. 15. r. *extend*. p. 94. l. 6. after *so* add *that*. p. 97. l. 17. r. *were*. p. 111. l. 13. r. *had*. p. 119. l. 13. r. *lower*. l. 21. r. *under*.



CHAP. I.

Wherein some general Considerations, relating to the authorities produced by Mr. Danvers, in favour of Antipedobaptism, are laid down; shewing the vanity and insignificancy of them, as to his purpose.



T is the Apostle *Jude*s exhortation, that we should earnestly contend for the faith, once delivered to the Saints; and there are two things in special, that all Saints, yet more especially those, upon whom this duty is peculiarly incumbent, ought to contend for, with reference to the Faith. First, its purity; Secondly, its integrity, that nothing be added thereto, nothing detracted there-from. And the Integrity of the Faith is of equal importance, and ought to be alike contended for, with the Purity thereof: Neither is the conditions or qualifications of any that attempt, either to corrupt it, by immixing their own Notions or Inventions

B

ons

ons therewith, or to make any breach therein ; a sufficient discharge from this duty : In the discharge whereof, yet regard is to be had, both to the persons with whom, and matters about which we do contend. Here sometimes we must contend earnestly with those that profess themselves to be, and it may be hoped, intentionally are, Contenders for the Faith ; yea, and sharply to rebuke them for, not only the opposition they make, but their unchristian managing that opposition against , while they pretend, and possibly really intend to contend for, the Faith.

As for the Doctrine of Infant Baptism ; the further vindication and establishment of which, is at present designed : That it is, as I have formerly said, and so am more and more confirmed, a part of that Faith once delivered to the Saints, and consequently the contending for it, comes within the Compass of that Exhortation.

It is true, a late Author, for whom I have so much charity, as to hope he has (though greatly failing in a due use and exercise of his Grace, yet) an habitual good will for Christ, and the Faith delivered by him ; has appeared not a little confident of the contrary ; and answerably, has conceived himself obliged to make the utmost opposition he could, against that Doctrine and Practice, and industriously to endeavour the establishment of Believers Baptism, in opposition thereunto. Which of our Confidences hath the surer ground, shall be left to the Judgment of all unprejudic'd persons: But to lay what he hath said in the Ballance. Two things he attempts to prove,
and

and seems to conceit that he has done both so effectually, as that he seems to stand amazed, that all men do not immediately fall down before the Evidence produced by him.

First, he attempts to prove, That the Baptism of Believers is only Christ's Ordinance of Baptism.

Secondly, That the Baptism of Infants is no Ordinance of Jesus Christ.

Both these he attempts to prove by Scripture, by Reason, and Humane Authority: and though he would seem to make no great account of humane Authority, yet it seems impossible to me, that any man of a competent understanding should arise to such a height of confidence, as to the truth of his Assertions, as he is arrived to, had he not other grounds for it, than what he hath produced, either from Scripture or Reason. Alas! what a poor Pamphlet would his Treatise be, were all his humane Authorities pared off, and it left to defend its Cause, merely by that evidence of Scripture and Reason it is furnished with; how evidently would the Scriptures, at least the most of them appear to be but meer repetitions of such Scriptures as have been answered again and again; without any shew of satisfaction given to those answers, or the least additional enforcement received from his application or improvement of them to his purpose.

What Reason does he offer, unless he will call his own ungrounded Dictates, or some frivolous deductions of supposed ill Consequences of the Practice he opposes by that name. I

cannot therefore but think that however he puts it off in words, yet indeed the principal ground, he lays to his great confidence, of having so effectually performed his undertaking, is the humane Authorities he has produced in favour of his Cause; they must not therefore be wholly passed by: Yet seeing himself seems to make no more account of them, they being as he expresses it, but *Argumentum ad hominem*; (the reason of his so expressing himself cannot but be guessed at, I suppose he designed them *ad faciendum populum*.) I shall only here offer some few Considerations with reference to them in general, and leave them, to every one to make what use and improvement of them they see meet, and take the less notice of them in particular, as they occur in the process of his Discourse.

First, that which offers it self to Consideration is our Authors great Unfaithfulness in his Quotations, and gross abuse of the Authors cited by him in favour of his Cause: Sometimes he seems to have meerly forged Testimonies, and to pretend Authors to have said, what he could wish they had; but what indeed never came into their minds, much less dropped from their pens: Sometimes he grossly perverts their words, wresting them to such a sense as apparently was never intended by them: Sometimes he mistakes, and fathers that upon one, which was spoken by another; *Testibus non testimoniis credendum est*, &c. but here no man can credit this Witness. And though variety of other instances

stances might be, and are by another hand given, of the like nature and import, yet I shall only instance in those Testimonies he cites out of the *Magdeburgensian History* (of which he gives, and that not undeservedly, a great *Encomium*) in the 1. 2. and 3. Centuries: *They tell us*, says he, in his 56. page, *that as to the business of Baptism in the 1. Century, they find to have been after this manner*; and he instances in six things, that they, as he saith, relate with reference to Baptism; four of which, if not five, concern his purpose no otherwise, than the furtherance of his Cause depends upon the bulk of his Book: that which only properly concerns his purpose is the first, which he sets down thus.

As to the Subjects of Baptism they tell us that in this Age (meaning the first Century, the Age wherein Christ and his Apostles lived) *they find that they baptized only the adult or aged, whether Jews or Gentiles, whereof they say we have instances in the 2. 8. 10. 16. 19. Chapters of the Acts*: But as to the baptizing of Infants they confess they read of no Example; And he has the confidence to direct his Reader to the Century, Book and Page, where he saith they tell us all this: Whereas they are so far from telling us all this, that they say the direct contrary. Their words are express, *Baptizatos esse adultos tam Judeos quam Gentes exempla probant, Act. 2. 8. 10. 16. 19. De infantibus baptizatis exempla quidem annotata non leguntur; sed Origenes, & Cyprianus, & alii Patres authores sunt Apostolorum etiam tempore baptizatos esse; constat etiam*

*Hoc ex Apostolorum scriptis, &c. i. e. That the Aged whether Jews or Gentiles were baptized, those examples, Act. 2. 8. 10. 16. 19. prove. It is true indeed we read not of any express examples of Infants being baptized: But that they were baptized even in the Apostles times, both Origen, Cyprian, and others of the Fathers do testifie; and this is also evident from the writings of the Apostles themselves: and then they shew us what evidence they conceived they had from the Writings of the Apostles that Infants were baptized. Now is this to tell us, that they find they baptiz'd only the Adult? Nay, do they not tell us expressly, that they find from the Writings of the Apostles, and the Testimonies of the Fathers that lived near those times, that they baptized Infants, as well as grown persons. As for what our Author further saith they tell us, concerning the Ceremonies attending the Administration of Baptism, as that the parties baptized did freely come, and offer themselves, professing their Faith; what ever they tell us of that nature, they evidently mean it of the Adult, for so, lest they should be mistaken and misrepresented, they do in plain words express themselves. *Ante Baptismatis impertitionem quoad adultos attinet de Doctrina Evangelii, &c. adultos edocuerunt*; they repeat that term *adult* twice, seeming to fear that their words might be wrested in favour of Antipedobaptism. Now then how far are these worthy Historians from saying *they find they baptized only the adult*; they tell us, that it is evident from the Apostles Writings, and also produce the Fathers living near those times, assuring us that Infants were then*

then baptized, though no expresse Example of their Baptizing is left upon Record. And having thus grossly abused these worthy Centuriators in this first Century, he proceeds both to abuse them, and impose upon his incautelous Reader in what he cites out of them in the 2. 3. and 4. Centuries; for thus he adds page 59. As to Baptism in the 2. Century, *They say* (meaning these Magdiburgenses) Century 2. Chap. 6. pag. 109. *that it doth not appear by any approved Authors that there was any mutation or variation from the former,* and in confirmation hereof quotes what *Justin Martyr* saith in his second Apology to *Anton. Pius* the Emperour. Now he would have the Reader believe they say this with reference to the Subjects of Baptism, and consequently that they hereby deny Infant baptism to be as yet brought into the Church; whereas they speak not at all in that place cited by him of the Subjects of Baptism, but only of the Rites and Ceremonies attending its Administration; for so they intitle their Discourse, *De Ritibus circa Baptismum*: And the instance they give of the Jew baptized in the wilderness by his fellow-travellers (a Story I suppose our Author was willing to overlook) plainly shews it. But when they speak of the Subjects of Baptism Chap. 4. p. 48. they say expressly, *Nec usquam legitur Infantes hoc sæculo à Baptismo remotos esse*, and cites *Origen*, as affirming that the Baptism of Infants had been received by the Church as a Tradition from the Apostles. And after the same manner does he most grossly abuse them, and impose upon his Reader in what he cites out of them in the

3. and 4. Century. But it is needless to trace him any farther ; by what hath been said we may see the great unfaithfulness of our Author : So that look what Censure *Erasmus* put upon *Origen's* Works, translated by *Ruffinus*, the same must be past upon his Treatise ; no man knows when he reads Mr. *Danvers*, and when he reads the Authors cited by him. And this consideration alone renders all his Quotations useless ; in as much as no man can trust him any farther than themselves examine the Authors produced by him ; and suppose they may find him faithful in any one, yet that is no assurance that he is so in any other. He that knowingly falsifies one Author, deserves no credit in what he cites from any other. But to proceed.

Secondly, That which lies obvious to our observation is the utter Usefulness, Insignificancy, and Impertinency of very many, if not the major part of the Testimonies produced by him as to his purpose, suppose he hath been faithful in them: This will abundantly appear in a four-fold Instance.

First, not a few speak nothing at all to his purpose ; it can hardly be imagined what came into his head to swell up his Book with them : Thus to give the Reader a few Instances, that he may make more thorough observation himself ; and he will be sooner furnished with plenty of Instances of the same nature. Thus in the 282. Page, where he attempts to prove the *Waldenses* were against Infants Baptism, he cites two of their ancient Confessions, wherein they profess themselves to own only Two Sacraments, viz. Baptism,

Baptism and the Lord's Supper ; and what can our Author infer from hence in favour of his Assertion? Did ever any make Infants Baptism a third Sacrament? So for what he cites out of *Vignier* his Ecclesiastical History, Page 283. makes as little for his purpose, he tells us they expressly declare to receive the Canon of the Old and New Testament, and to reject all Doctrines that have not their foundation in, or are in any thing contrary to it; therefore condemn all the Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church of *Rome*. And who among Protestants may not be proved to reject Infants Baptism, if such Professions may go for proof? For our Author himself to fancy that Infant-baptism is a humane Tradition or Ceremony, and conceit, without any rational ground, that others have done so too; and hereupon to apply all that they have said or written, either for the perfection or sufficiency of the Scriptures, or against humane Traditions or Ceremonies, as an evidence of their being against Infant-baptism, superlatively absurd and ridiculous. Of the same nature is that he tells us out of *Socrates* and *Crispin's* Histories, Page 272. concerning Pope *Innocent*, banishing the Donatists out of *Rome*, and the agreement between them and the Novatians, in the things there mentioned: what does all that make to prove that they were against the baptizing of Infants? Must every one that any Pope hath banished out of *Rome* be presently an Anabaptist; or must all those that agree in the things there expressed be against baptizing of Infants? By such kind of proofs

proofs who may not be made Anabaptists ? But to leave the Reader to make his own observation and to proceed.

Secondly, nothing can be rationally concluded from others of his Authorities in favour of what he designs the proof of by them : Thus in his 282. 283. 284. Pages he cites two more ancient Waldensian Confessions of Faith, with their Treatise of Antichrist ; wherein they profess their belief : That in the Sacrament of Baptism, Water is the visible and external Sign which represents unto Believers, that, which by the invisible vertue of God's operating is within them : as also they profess that by Baptism they are received into the holy Congregation of the people of God, there openly protesting and declaring their Faith and amendment of Life : So that God is worshipped in vain, when persons are enjoined to partake of Sacraments without Faith and Truth. So they condemned Antichrist for attributing Regeneration to the outward work of baptizing Children (for that is all they condemn him for ;) though our Author misrepresents their words, and makes them little less than nonsense, that they may seem more fully to favour his Cause. But now who can rationally conclude from all this, that they were against Infant-baptism ; seeing the very same, or like Professions have been made, and the like Expressions used by the generality of the Protestants in their Confessions and other Writings, who yet have zealously asserted Infant-baptism. To instance only in the *Helvetian Confession*, whose words are these, *We by being baptized*

tized do confess our Faith ; and yet in the very next page say, *We condemn the Anabaptists, who deny, that any Infants born of faithful Parents are to be baptized.* How far such Expressions are consistent with the Doctrine and Practice of Infant-baptism may be considered by and by : But to interpret such Expressions, or Professions, as an Evidence of the Authors denial of Infant-baptism is irrational ; seeing they are the Expressions and Professions, commonly made by those who professedly own the Doctrine, and live in the Practice of Infant-baptism. Again , for what our Author tells us, that Doctor *Usher* cites out of *Thuanus*, *That several of the Berengarians, did upon examination say, That Baptism did not profit Children to salvation* , page 288. who can rationally infer from thence, that they denied Infant-baptism ? They might deny that Baptism profited Children to Salvation, especially that it did profit them meerly *opere operato*, which was the thing they denied, and yet not deny their Baptism : But to hasten. By what hath been said, it evidently appears that our Author cannot produce any one Article in all their Confessions, nor one Passage out of any of their own Writings, that make it so much as probable, that the *Waldenses* were against Infant-baptism. He hath only groundless Suppositions, false Reports, malicious Accusations of their Enemies, to ground his persuasions of their rejecting Infant-baptism upon ; when it is evident on the other hand from their own Confessions, and other Writings, that they did, at least as to the Generality of them, own and live in that Practice.

Etice. Variety of other instances might be given, but let these suffice. Therefore

Secondly, other of his Authorities, though they seem, according to the Letter of the words cited by him, somewhat to countenance his Assertions, yet nothing less was intended by the Authors themselves; neither can their words, all things considered, be rationally interpreted at all in favour of them: Of this kind are, if not universally all, yet the most of those Testimonies he cites out of the Writings of Pedobaptists. What they speak of, or with reference to the Adult, he will needs press into the service of his Cause, and apply them for the exclusion of Infants from Baptism, and establishment of Believers Baptism in opposition thereunto.

Thus all those Quotations out of *Calvin, Piscator, Perkins* and *Paræus*, to prove, that the Commission given by Christ to his Disciples must be understood, as restraining Baptism only to Believers; so almost throughout his whole Book. It is in vain to enumerate Instances.

It's true, he grants their Judgment and Practice was for Infant-baptism; but says he in his Preface, to take his own words, *By how much they were against the Truth* (so he calls his Opinion) *in their Practice, by so much the Power and Providence of God may appear, so to make their Tongues and Pens to fall upon themselves.*

And he takes Mr. *Baxter* as a special Instance of the Power and Providence of God in this matter, To which let me say, Before he had interested the Power and Providence of God in matters

matters of this nature, he should have offered something at least to prove the inconsistency of what they have written, with the Doctrine and Practice of Infant-baptism; lest he be found to take the Name of God in vain, as well as abuse his Authors and Readers, which he hath not at all attempted to do: Wherein is the Contradiction between what they say of, or with respect to the Adult, and what they say and practise with reference to Infants? Sure unto Contradictions so much is at least absolutely necessary, That *affirmatio & negatio sit de eodem aut respectu ejusdem*. Our Lord Christ says to the Jews, *Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins*; yet speaking of Infants, saith, *Of such is the kingdom of heaven*: Now who ever had so little understanding as to argue against Christ's intending Infants from a supposition, that then he must needs contradict himself in what he says to the Jews.

Again, says Paul, *He that will not work let him not eat*, yet exhorts aged women to teach young women, as other duties, so this *to love their Children*, which surely includes the giving them necessary food: Now will any be so prophane and irrational as to say, here appears the Power and Providence of God in making Paul's Tongue and Pen to fall upon himself.

Thus Calvin and other Pedobaptists say, that men may rightly offer themselves to Baptism; Confession of sins is required, otherwise the whole action would be nothing else but sport, yet adding an express, *Notandum est de adultis hic verba fieri*: and then elsewhere says

The

That the Covenant, and Promises are extended to the Infants of Believers, and on that ground they are to be baptized.

And now Mr. *Danvers* presently conceits here's a wonderful Power and Providence of God in so making their Tongues and Pens to fall upon themselves; yet attempts not to shew wherein the inconsistency between what they say with reference to the Adult, and what they say with reference to Infants does appear.

But it may be it will be said, however others may be reconciled to themselves, yet Mr. *Baxter* cannot; for he speaks more significantly, he says of the Commission: It purposely expresseth the Disciples several works, in their several Places and Orders. Their first task is to make Disciples, which are by *Mark* called Believers; their second work is to baptize them, whereunto is annexed the Promise of Salvation; the third work is to teach them all other things. So again he argues most significantly: If there can be no Example given in Scripture, of any one that was baptized without profession of a saving Faith, nor any Precept for so doing, then we must not baptize any without it: But the Antecedent is true, therefore the Consequent: And he often useth exclusive terms; saith that Jesus Christ hath by Scripture-precept and Example, directed us to baptize those that profess true Repentance, and no other, and therefore we must baptize them and no other.

Now says Mr. *Danvers* in his Preface, These Assertions, in the apprehension of such ignorant Creatures as we are, seem to be as contrary to his

his former Writings (he means those wherein he pleads for Infant-baptism) as light is to darkness. But let me only say, that though it is possible, there are such ignorant Creatures in the world as he talks of, yet I much suspect he himself is not so ignorant as he pretends; for I doubt not but he knows full well, that Mr. *Baxter* plainly enough declares, that they are only the Adult he speaks with reference to, in all that he saith of this nature: and wherein any difficulty should ly in reconciling all that he saith with reference to them, with what he says, with reference to Infants, our Author shews us not, neither can he: for who can imagine that a man should contradict himself, when he expressly declares he speaks of, or with reference to different Subjects. Where is the Contradiction between saying, that the Commission of Christ for preaching and baptizing, as it respects, and is to be executed with reference to the Adult, it must be executed in this order.

First, persons must be taught or made Disciples, and then baptized: But as for Infants, the case is different, they have a right to the Covenant and Promises, as descending from believing Parents, and on that account are to be baptized. Now I say who can rationally suppose this man, as thus expressing himself; should contradict himself; men must be very ignorant indeed, that need help to reconcile such things as these, and from hence we may see, how utterly useless and insignificant all that our Author hath cited out of the writings of the Pedobaptist is, as to his cause.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, Not a few of his Authorities, either speak expressly against him. or if they may seem to speak any thing for, yet as much or more against him, whence his Cause stands condemned out of the mouth of his own Witnesses: Thus attempting to prove that in the third Century, believers baptism was only practised. Having greatly abused (though as the Reader may easily see, little to his own advantage) the worthy Magdeburgenses, who expressly say in the very page cited by himself, and consequently (unless he received his Collections from another hand) could not but know it, *Baptizabantur autem in utroque sexu adulti simul, & infantes* (Cent. 3. Chap. 6. pag. 124.) he brings in Mr. Baxter as saying in his Principles of Love, pag. 7. *that he knew in the days of Tertullian, Nazianzen, and Austin, men had liberty to be baptized, or to bring their Children when, and at what age they pleased.*

Now take his words as cited by our Author, yet they make more against him than for him; for if men might bring their Children, to Baptism when, and at what age they pleased, then they might bring them in their infancy, yea, *Mox postquam editi* as Cyprian's phrase is, though there was no humane Law to enforce them so to do. So again, whereas he had brought in several councils, and particular Authors to bear witness as he speaks to believers baptism, in opposition to that of Infants in the Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Century, page 76, 78. yet after (*viz.*) in the 2. Chapter of his Second Part, he brings in some of these very Councils, and Authors, as ordaining and bearing witness to Infant baptism, yea

yea, and affirming that it was in those very ages the practice of the Universal Church, and had been so time out of mind.

For brevity sake, let us only take a more exact account of those two renowned Authors, viz; *Chrysostom*, and *Austin*, both these he cites as witnesses for believers Baptism, Pag. 76. yet see what he cites out of both these for Infant-Baptism, *Chrysostom's* words as cited by himself, Pag. 121. are these, *Infants ought to be Baptized as universally received by the Catholick Church, to take away Original Sin*, so that Infant-Baptism was in *Chrysostom's* days, *the universal practice of the Church*. *Austin's* words as cited by himself Pag. 152. are these, *if there be any that do enquire for a Divine Authority for the Baptizing of Children, let them know, that what the universal Church holds, nor was instituted by Councils, but always retained, is most rightfully believed to have been delivered by no other than an Apostolical Authority* so that here is a Witness of our Authors own bringing forth, who affirms *verbis rotundis*.

First, that the universal Church did then hold Infant-Baptism.

Secondly, That it was not instituted by any Council, I may add, much less then by any particular man.

Thirdly, That it had been always retained, that is, ever since the days of the Apostles.

Fourthly, That hereupon it is most rightfully believed to have been delivered by no other than Apostolical Authority.

And what other Testimonies to the universal practice of Infant-Baptism in those Ages, do we

need, or can we desire; than what our Authors own witnessess give.

And here let it be observed, that these two Authors lived in that very Age, when he saith Infant Baptism, was instituted, and imposed by Pope *Innocent*; but whether it be in the least degree probable that it was indeed so, let all men Judge: but of that more hereafter.

If any shall say, if these Councils, and Fathers were for Believers Baptism, and yet practised Infant Baptism, how shall they be reconciled, how shall we reconcile their Doctrine to their Practice? Now for that our Author himself hath brought forth two Decrees, the former of *Justinian*, the other of *Justinus* the Emperours, that will fully reconcile this seeming Contradiction; *Justinian's* Decree was this, as recited by our Author Pag. 127. *that Children should be admitted to Baptism, but that those that were come to their full growth, shall be taught before they be Baptized.* See again the decree of *Justinus* to the same purpose, in the same Page; whence it appears, that these Councils, and Fathers, were for the Baptizing of Believers afore unbaptized, (as we still are) and also for the Baptism of their infants. So that as our Author hath shewed us, how to understand the Fathers, and consequently all other Pedo-Baptists, when they speak of Baptizing grown Persons, or of Prerequisites to their Baptism, so he hath rendred the summ of all his quotations, either out of the Fathers, or modern Pedo-Baptists, utterly insignificant and useless, as to his purpose: And how his pen comes thus to fall upon himself, and his own Cause, I shall desire

desire him to enquire, and leave all other men to judge.

Other instances of this nature might be taken notice of, as when he cites Dr. *Owen* to prove that that Promise *Gen. 17. vers. 7.* belongs only to the spiritual seed of *Abraham* Pag. 210. the Doctor saith *the effectual dispensation of the Covenant is peculiar to them only.* Plainly, implying that some grace is dispenced to others, though the effectual dispensation be peculiar to them, but let that suffice for the Second Consideration relating to his Authorities.

Thirdly, That which yet further is to be Considered, is the incredibility, and unregardableness of those Testimonies produced by him, that do more plainly, and expressly favour his assertions, and they are incredible and unregardable, either in regard of the Authors, or the Testimonies themselves.

First, Some are not at all to be Credited in regard of the Authors whose Testimonies they are: Thus for all those testimonies (excepting those taken out of their own writings, the usefulness of which we have already seen) cited to prove the *Waldenses* to be opposers of Infant Baptism. They are either the Testimonies of the Papists, their inveterate Enemies, or of Protestants only relating what the Papists charged them with; unto which Charges, themselves gave no Credit: though as to these last, our Author so sets down their Testimonies, as that his Reader may believe, they are the Testimonies of those Authors themselves, concerning these *Waldenses*, when as they only relate the Charges the Papists

loaded them with ; thus in his *Pag. 286.* says he, the *Magdeburgenses, Cent. 11. Chap. 5. Pag. 240.* tell us, *that Beringarius did in the time of Leo the Ninth. about the Year 1049. publicly maintain his heresy, which they set down to be denying of transubstantiation, and Baptism to little ones.* Now an incautelous Reader, would think these *Magdeburgenses* themselves, had set down these things to be *Beringarius* his heresies, when as they only tell us, what the Papists charged him with, the truth of which charge, themselves believed not. So again in his *Pag. 290.* says he, speaking of *Peter Bruis*, another worthy Minister among the *Waldenses*, whose Doctrines and Positions for which he suffered, we have recorded by the *Magdeburgenses*, and *Lucas Osiander*, among which, we find those about Baptism, &c.

Here again ordinary Readers unacquainted with these Histories, may think they set down these to be the Doctrines and Positions, for which this worthy man suffered, when as they only set down what the Papists charged him with. And what Credit is to be given to the Papists, let all men judge.

But it may be, it will be said they did not only charge them with denying of Infant-Baptism, but some of them at least wrote largely in Confutation of these Doctrines and Positions, and surely that they would never have done, unless they had certainly known them to hold and maintain them: To that I would only say; I suppose our Author would think himself, and his party hardly dealt with, if all the Tenets and Practises charged upon them by some of their Opposers, and
in

in the confutation of which, and that as their Tenets and Practises they have largely written, should be believed as true of them. Would he be willing that men should believe that to Baptize naked is the ordinary practice of all, yea, or the generality of Anabaptists, because Mr. *Baxter* hath spent some pages, to shew the evil of that practice.

Alas, how common, yea too common is it for men, and that sometimes good men too, suddenly to take up ungrounded reports concerning the Opinions and Practises of those who dissent from them, and then apply themselves to a zealous confutation of such Opinions and Practises, alas, if such things may go for proof, who may not be proved to hold what their souls have abhorred, or to reject what they have zealously asserted, and lived in the belief and practice of,

Secondly, Other of his Testimonies deserve no credit, or regard, in respect of the Testimonies themselves, thus to instance in those Testimonies produced out of Authors living since the Fifth Century, as *Willifrid*, *Strabo*, *Boemius*, *Ludovicus Vives*, or any other Contemporary with, or consequent unto them, to prove that Infant-Baptism was not practised in the primitive times, or first ages of the Church.

What ever they say of that import, yet no rational man can give any credit to their words, they producing no Authorities, offering no Reasons upon which they grounded their assertions. It is true, the last mentioned, *viz.* *Ludovicus Vives*, who saith as our Author relates his words, *Pag.* 88. and of whose Testimony great use is

made by the men of his perswasion, *that none were Baptized of old, but those that were of Age, who did not only understand what the mystery of the water meant, but desired the same*, he seems to have bottomed this Assertion upon a twofold ground.

First, That as he supposed they continued to Baptize the Adult in *Italy* even in his days.

Secondly, His other Ground seems to have been the proposal of Questions, (a custom then in use) unto Infants at their Baptism, which were answered by their Sureties for them: But now that these Grounds are too weak to bear his Assertion is evident. For,

First, As for his first Ground, it was his mere mistake, there was no such practice of Baptizing the Adult, exclusive of Infants in *Italy* in his days, and therefore *Bellarmin* citing this passage out of *Ludovicus Vives*, leaves out this Ground, knowing (himself being an Italian) the falsity of it, as *Gerard* observes, *Tom. 4. Pag. 119.*

Secondly, For his other Ground, it proves nothing, in as much as that custom of proposing Questions to Infants had its rise, not from the way of procedure in primitive times towards the seed of believing Parents, as grown up, but from the custom of interrogating the Adult, converted from among the heathen, antecedent to their Baptism; whereunto some conceive the Apostle *Peter* alludes, when Infants were also Baptized: So that as he had no true Ground for his Assertion, so the other, whose Testimonies are of the same import, offer no ground, for what they do assert, we have only their bare words; how they
came

came to know what they affirm, they tell us not; and that they had indeed no real Ground for what they say, is sufficiently evident from what hath been already said, and will more fully appear hereafter.

Now, who can give any credit to a few obscure Authors, when they have only their naked Assertions without any shew of proof, and for which, it evidently appears they had no Ground. Now then, considering our Authors great unfaithfulness in reference to his Authorities, the apparent uselessness and insignificancy of so great a part of them, as to his purpose; the incredibility and unregardableness of others, that speak more home and full to his purpose; surely the great variety and multiplicity of his Quotations, cannot much move any rational or unbiassed persons. And hence, to add any thing more with reference to them may seem superfluous, yet let me just mention two things more.

And therefore Fourthly, Consider, which our Author himself calls us to do, of how little force humane Testimonies are, for the weakning or establishing any Doctrine or Practice in the minds and Judgments of those, in whom that prophecy *take place, they shall wait for the Law at his (id est) Christs Mouth.* *Si quid dicitur absque scriptura claudicat auditorum cogitatio*, saith Chrysostom, and that of Austin is known, *alios ita lego, ut quantalibet sanctitate, doctrinaque prepolliant, non adeo verum putem quia ipsi ita senserunt, sed quia mihi vel per illos Authores canonicos, vel probabili ratione quod à veritate non abhorreant persuadere potuerunt.* And surely to note it by the way, nei-

C 4

ther

ther of these would take up Infant-Baptism merely as a tradition : It is Divine Authority that can only establish the minds of sincere Christians ; the Judgment of this or that man is of no great weight to those who have chosen Christ, as their teacher, and Governour, as well as their Priest to save them. It is true, in matters of Fact, credible witnesses are to be regarded, and in doubtful cases, it gives no little ease to the mind, to be credibly informed in the practice of the Church throughout all Ages past.

Lastly, Let it be considered, that would we appeal to, and put the decision of the present controversy into the hands of humane Authors, how infallibly it would be determined on our side; for this I dare appeal to Mr. *Danvers* himself, at least to his book. But to pass from this, from what hath been said, It evidently appears to how little purpose our Author hath bestowed so great pains; and that at last, as he and all that expect satisfaction in and about the practice Controverted, must, so we freely do appeal from Humane to Divine Testimonies. And answerably, I shall proceed to the examination of what he hath said from Scripture in confirmation of the one, and the other of his Assertions.

C H A P. II.

Wherein his Six Particulars, to prove that the Baptism of Believers is only Christs Ordinance of Baptism, are examined their Weakness and Vanity fully discovered.

THE First is this, (*viz.*) *That the Baptizing of Believers, is only to be esteemed Christs Ordinance of Baptism, this he attempts to prove.*

1. From Christs positive institution and Commission commanding of it; and having recited the words of the Commission, he concludes, *Here we have this plain order of Christ laid down.*

1. *That men should be taught the doctrine of Faith.*

2. *That being so taught they should be baptized.*

3. *That they should in his School or Church, whereof they are then made members, be instructed in every thing else they ought to learn.*

With reference unto which, I may say in *Jobs* words to his friend *Bildad*: *How hast thou helped him that has no power? How savest thou the arm that hath no strength? Job 26. 2.* Can our Author think that the bare recital of a Text of Scripture, that hath been answered over and over, again and again with a crude, *where we have this plain order of Christ laid down,* can satisfy an impartial enquiring mind, that

Baptism

Baptism must necessarily, and that universally be administred exactly according to this order here laid down ? Surely it concerns those that will plead the Cause of Believers Baptism, in opposition to that of Infants, both to shew the insufficiency of those answers given, and also evince the necessary exclusion of Infants from Baptism by this Commission, as exprest and laid down in the order insisted upon. May such insipid repetitions, and crude assertions determine Controversies ; those whose lot it is to speak last, will infallibly carry the Cause, and have the Truth determined on their side : whence I might fairly dismiss this his first particular, with only this reply : 'Tis fully answered already. But though I have largely spoken to the arguings of our opponents from this Commission elsewhere ; yet

Infants Baptism
from heaven pag.
288. pag. 290.

because they insist so much upon it, and seem to think that the bare recital of it is sufficient to establish their practice ; I shall consider it a little further, and lay down a threefold conclusion with reference to it.

1. That this Commission (Institution, it is not) taken abstractly in it self : does not necessarily exclude Infants from Baptism : And if it do not necessarily exclude them, they may be Baptized (supposing their Baptism elsewhere in Scripture warranted) notwithstanding our Lord Christ has exprest himself as he has done ; and that this Commission does not necessarily exclude Infants from Baptism is sufficiently evident these two ways.

1. From the general acknowledgement of our opposers themselves; they Universally, for ought I have yet understood from any of them, profess that in case Infant-Baptism could be clearly proved from any other place of Scripture, they would readily own, and practice it: which would be absurd, in case this Commission did necessarily limit Baptism to Believers: For that would be to suppose that the Scriptures might warrant a practice in contradiction to themselves. And how vain is the bare recital of a Scripture, which themselves grant does not necessarily prove, what it is produced for the proof of.

2. This is evident, because as here is no express mention of Infants; So no Word, Phrase or Clause, that can be rationally interpreted, as necessarily excluding them. I know it will be said, *That our Lord Christ not mentioning of them, together with the order exprest, for the administration of baptism, is sufficient ground to conclude that they were excluded.* But to that, I answer, That that is no sufficient ground to conclude they are excluded, will undeniably appear from adouble consideration.

1. That it is possible Christ may have given this Commission, only with reference to the adult, and may have sufficiently declared his will concerning the Baptism of Infants, in other parts of his word: which suppose we should affirm he has; As our opposers would have *the order pleaded for*, exactly observed by us; so no prejudice would arise to our Cause thereby, seeing our only enquiry then must be, whether Christ has
in

in any part of his word warranted the Baptism of Infants. For I suppose no man will deny that Christ may declare his mind, as to the administration of Baptism, to some in one part of his word; and his Mind and Will as to its administration unto others in another. Whence it is undeniable, that Infants are not necessarily excluded from Baptism by this Commission. Suppose they are not included in it; yet its impossible to evince their exclusion by it, seeing it is possible it may wholly respect Subjects of a different Species. But

2. That our Lord Christ might not, as it is certain he did not intend this Commission, as fully and absolutely directive of his Apostles and Ministers in the Administration of these Ordinances of Preaching and Baptizing, unto the administration of which they are in the general commissioned and appointed: 'Tis no way necessary; (neither can I think our opposers will dare to affirm that it is.) that our Lord Christ should expressly declare his whole mind in any part of his word, no not in the Commission it self, for the administration of them: Concerning the administration of any of his Ordinances, he may give out a more general Commission warranting their Administration and yet further Directions elsewhere, relating both to the administrators, manner of Administration, and Subjects to whom they are to be Administred. And hence it will undeniably follow, though Infants are not expressly mentioned in this Commission, yet they may be included and comprehended in it. Because though the Will of Christ concerning them,

29

is not plainly here declared, yet it may be found among the various further directions he has elsewhere given, relating to the administration of those two Ordinances, of Preaching, and Baptizing : And that our Lord Christ never intended this Commission, as fully directive of the Apostles and Ministers of the Gospel in the execution of it, is fully evident from the indeterminableness of all questions and cases relating to the right administration of the fore-mentioned Ordinances by the Commission it self, I shall instance in these Five or Six,

1. How the Nations were to be *Discipled*, whether only by teaching them, or by Baptizing them ? Some have thought (whose Judgment yet I approve not) that Baptism is appointed as the means by which the Nations should be Discipled or made Disciples ; and plenty of instances may be brought to shew that the participle is frequently used to denote the means by which any end is accomplished, and why it may not be so used here, our Opposers will be hard put to it to evince from the Commission it self.

2. Who among the Nations or among those to whom the Gospel is preached, ought to be accounted Disciples, and as such the proper subjects of Baptism ? We know what a contest has been among some, what that Faith or Embrace-ment of the Gospel is that qualifies men for Baptism, neither is it possible for our opposers to determine that question from the commission it self.

3. Whether the Nations were to be Baptized as discipled, or as men ? Neither does this question

tion admit of an easie decision from the commission it self, (though from other Scriptures it does) seeing that Pronoun, *them*, does evidently refer to Nations as its proper antecedent, whether we translate μαθηταὶ ὧτε, teach or make disciples as has been elsewhere proved.

4. After what manner Baptism ought to be administred, whether by dipping, or by pouring, or sprinkling water upon the face or body of the Party Baptized : That Baptism be administred after a right manner, *our Author* looks upon as essential to that Ordinance, and consequently that a defect therein nullifies it, and makes it no Ordinance of Christ; yet that the word used in the Commission does not determine what the manner should be, is certain past all rational exception. *Our Author* must unavoidably take the assistance of other Scriptures, for the determining that controversie, and yet must leave it in *medio* when he has done.

5. Whether only Males, or both Males and Females should be Baptized is not exprest in, neither is it determinable from the Commission it self, αὐτοῖς translated *them* being of the masculine gender, may seem to restrain Baptism, only to Males, and is as clear a ground, for excluding Females, as the order laid down by Christ is for the excluding of Infants.

6. Whether Adult Persons only upon their Discipleship, or they and their Infant seed with them, are the proper Subjects of Baptism; and seeing that we must of necessity have recourse to other revelations that our Lord Christ has made of his Will, relating to these two Ordinances of Preaching,

Preaching, and Baptizing, for the determining the Five former questions or cases. Let our *Author*, or any other shew any solid reason, why we may not do the same for the determining this last, which I shall expect *ad Græcas calendas*. From what hath been said, it undenyably appears that this Commission, as abstractly taken in it self, is not a full and compleat direction for the right discharge of those duties, it doth more generally authorize and require the performance of. Whence will follow, as shining with a noon-like light, the truth of this first conclusion, That the Commission does not exclude, but on the other hand may include the Baptism of Infants, though they are not mentioned in it, yet the Will of our Lord Christ concerning them may be, as we affirm it is, sufficiently declared in those other rules and directions, relating to the due discharge of it. And this First Conclusion (the truth of which appearing with so much clearness of evidence) does so fully answer and obviate all arguments and objections pleadable from this Commission, against the practice we contend for, that I might well dismiss this first Argument without any further reply. But if any shall yet say surely if it had been the Will of our Lord Christ, that Infants should have been Baptized, he would have plainly declared it.

Ans. To that I answer, that it was vastly more necessary, that seeing it was his Will that Females as well as Males should be Baptized, he should have plainly expressed that; and yet we see he hath not done it. Yea, let me say, of which more hereafter, that in case it had been the will

of our Lord Christ, that Infants should not be Baptized, it had been much more necessary that he should have plainly declared that; than, it being his Will they should be Baptized, it was necessary he should plainly declare that: So that there is no reason why it should seem strange to any that upon supposition of its being the Will of Christ, that Infants should be Baptized, yet he hath not plainly exprest it in the Commission. We see there are other things that it is as necessary, yea, and more necessary, that they should have been plainly exprest, and yet they are not; yea, the very not mentioning Infants, does strongly imply his Will that they should be Baptized, in as much as had it been his Will that they should not be Baptized, it had been vastly more necessary he should have clearly exprest it, than it being his will they should, he should plainly exprest that. But for the further satisfiying of this scruple, I shall lay down a Second Conclusion.

2. That our Lord Christ having else-where so fully reveiled his will concerning the Infant-seed of his people, both as to their interest in the Covenant, and right to the seal and token thereof; the Commission though not expresly mentioning them, yet does sufficiently warrant and authorize the Ministers of the Gospel to Baptize them, as well as the Adult upon their profession of Faith. For the clearing up and illustration of this, let either of these two suppositions be put.

1. That God had sent his Prophets or any of them, having the first Testament administration, to preach the Gospel, as then reveiled unto the heathens or any Nation among them in order unto the

the uniting of them to, or incorporation of them in the Jewish Church: Or,

2. That he had continued Circumcision under the Gospel Administration, either of which things he might have done, had it so pleased him. Now I would ask any rational man, whether this very Commission, only substituting Circumcision in the room of Baptism, had not sufficiently warranted the Circumcision of Infants as well as grown persons, though they had not been expressly mentioned? had it not been enough to have said, Go Teach or Disciple all Nations, and let them be circumcised to the Lord? would any in either of these cases have scrupled whether Infants should have been circumcised upon that ground, that their Circumcision was not expressly mentioned? Surely no scruple in either of these cases would have ever entred into the hearts of men: And why any scruple should now arise seeing the Covenant is one and the same, only there is a substitution of Baptism in the room of Circumcision, as the sign or token of it, no satisfactory account can be given. But yet to make things more plain let me put this one supposition more.

Suppose our Lord Christ had in more words exprest himself in this Commission thus, *Go teach or disciple all Nations baptizing them, for the Covenant with the promises thereof, shall now be extended to, and established with both the Jews and Gentiles and their households, in special their Children, as it hath hitherto been to and with the Jews in special*: Had he thus exprest himself, he had not come much short of mentioning Infants: Why,

let but Scriptures be compared together, and it is *tantamount*, it is all one as if he had so exprest himself. Says *Peter* to those awakened Jews, *Repent and be Baptized, for the promise is to you and your children*: Says *Paul* to a Gentile, *Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved and thy house*. Now lay the words of these two Apostles together, and suppose them spoken by either of them, at one and the same time, and that both to Jews and Gentiles, alike awakened to a sense of their sin and misery; and it had been all one as if he should have said, *Repent and believe, and thereby become the disciples of Christ, and be baptized, for then the promise of Salvation is to you*, that is; it does appertain to you and to your children and households. And these words, as thus spoken, must needs be spoken by vertue and in pursuance of the Commission they had received from Christ, and consequently they must needs have warrant from the Commission thus to speak. From whence it undeniably follows, that so much is virtually included in the Commission: And it is all one as if Christ had exprest himself in the Commission, in the very words or to the sense afore declared. And what attempts our opposers make to obscure the evidence that these Scriptures taken singly and severally give to the practice of Infant-baptism; the same they might as rationally have made, in case our Lord Christ had so exprest himself in the Commission: Let truth appear never so plainly some will cavil against it. But possibly some will yet say, If Infants should be Baptized, then the Order of Christ is crossed.

Ans. To this I shall say only in the general, that Christs order cannot be crossed by the observation of those rules and directions himself has given for the guidance of his Ambassadors, in the discharge of that duty required in this Commission; as the Baptism of Women no way opposes the mind of Christ, he having elsewhere given direction for their Baptism, though this Commission, according to the letter, only respects men; so the Baptism of Infants no way crosses Christs order, he having elsewhere declared his Will that they should be Baptized, though according to the letter the Commission might seem only to respect the Adult. But that I may give more full satisfaction to this objection, I shall lay down a third Conclusion.

Conclus. 3. That notwithstanding it is the will of Christ that Infants should be Baptized, yet it was very rational, yea necessary, that he should express this Commission in and according to the order he hath done. For let but three things be considered.

1. What was the state and condition of the Nations to whom the Apostles were now sent; they were in a state of darkness and ignorance, wholly estranged from God and his ways. Hence the preaching of the Gospel antecedently to the administration of Baptism was absolutely necessary: The Parents must be disciplined before Baptism could be regularly administered, either to themselves or to their Children.

2. Consider the gradual procedure the Gospel should, and answerably has made in subduing the Nations unto Christ; there always has been and

still is some Nations to be discipled and brought home to Christ, and all attempts to disciple them and bring them unto Christ, must be by first preaching the Gospel to them: The discipleship of Parents, still preparing the way to their own and their Childrens Baptism. Hence this Commission as exprest according to this order was necessary, not only for the Apostles who were to begin the work of discipling the Nations, but for all Ministers in succeeding ages, as they should be called out to perfect that work.

3. Consider, that when Nations are discipled, yet the preaching of the Gospel has a precedency to the administration of Baptism; the seed of believers Baptized in their Infancy, must be taught and thereby brought to a sincere embracement and performance of the conditions of the Covenant, into which as the seed of such Parents they were afore received in order to their conveying unto their Children a right to the Covenant, and Baptism as the seal and token thereof. Now then let but these three Conclusions be laid together, and I shall freely appeal to all rational men, whether this Commission can with any shew of reason be interpreted as restraining Baptism to Believers only, to the exclusion of their Infant-seed. We see the Commission does not necessarily exclude Infants; it does sufficiently warrant their Baptism, though they are not expressly mentioned; and it was necessary, though the Will of Christ be that they should be Baptized, yet that he should exprest the Commission according to the order he has done. But to proceed.

2. *Our Author* argues from the Apostles doctrine: And

3. To

3. To joyn these two arguments together. from the Example and Practice of the Primitive Saints; the sum of both which arguments amounts to thus much:

If the Apostles in their Doctrine did teach, that believers should be Baptized, and there is no instance to be found of any other teaching; and in conformity to this Doctrine, many Believers are recorded to be baptized, and no instance of any Infants; then believers Baptism is only Christs Ordinance of Baptism: But the antecedent is true, therefore the consequent.

Ans. To which I would only say four things.

1. That the Apostles did in their doctrine teach that the promise of salvation did belong, and consequently that the Covenant of Grace, in which that promise is contained, is still extended to the Houses or Families of believers, and that as such.

2. That they did exhort persons to be Baptized upon that account, that the promise did belong to them: And if some ought to be Baptized upon the account of their interest in the promise, then all that have a like interest in the promise may be Baptized upon the account of that their interest. These two things have been sufficiently proved else-where. And hence, though the Apostles did not in expresse terms teach Infant-baptism, yet their Doctrine does necessarily imply it.

Infant-Baptism
from Heaven
Chap. 6. See
also Chap. 10.
pag. 262. to
271.

3. That they did Baptize whole households, and that sometimes such in which we read not of any converted save only the Heads or Chief Governours, which, especially considering the two

foregoing particulars, makes it vastly more probable, that they did baptize some Infants, than the silence of the Scriptures, as to particular instances of Infants being baptized, that they did not baptize them. When the Apostles shall positively assert that the promises of the Covenant do belong to the houses of Believers, and that as such; and then in their doctrine lay interest in the promise as a sufficient ground for the application of Baptism; and now shall baptize several households, in some of which there is no intimation that any were Believers, save only the Heads or chief of them. Surely here is a vastly more probable ground to conclude, that as in their doctrine they did teach, so they did practice Infant-baptism, than the Scriptures barely not recording the Baptism of any Infants, is to conclude that they did not. Why may not the Scriptures not mentioning the faith of the household, be as strong an argument to prove that some in such households had not a personal Faith, as their not mentioning the Baptism of Infants is to prove that no Infants were baptized. But to pass that

4. That the Scriptures not recording that the Apostles did preach or practice Infant-Baptism, is no argument to prove that they did not both preach and practice it; Could our Author have produced any one Scripture wherein the Apostles in their doctrine did exclude Infants from Baptism, or in their practice did refuse to Baptize them, he had said somewhat to his purpose; and till that can be done, the multiplication of Scriptures, which alone concern the Baptism of believers, signify just nothing; inasmuch as they might teach

each and administer Baptism, as is declared in those Scriptures, and yet teach the doctrine of, and practise Infant-baptism also.

4. *Our Author* further argues from the spiritual ends and uses of Baptism : And thus he seems to argue, If believers are only capable of the spiritual ends, and uses of Baptism, then they are the only proper Subject of Baptism ; but the Antecedent is true, therefore so is the Consequent.

Ans^w. Would he have concluded any thing to his purpose by this argument, he should have proved at least one of these two things.

1. That Infants are not capable of any of these ends with reference unto which Baptism is appointed Or : else,

2. That none ought to be baptized, unless capable of all the end and uses for which Baptism is appointed : but neither of these things does he or can he rationally affirm ; and hence this argument signifies as little as any of his former. I shall therefore wave the particular Consideration of those several ends and uses of Baptism mentioned by him, and only in brief prove these two things. Only remember that at present my work is not to prove Infant-baptism, only to shew the insufficiency and weakness of this argument, taken from the uses and ends of Baptism, to prove that none ought to be Baptized but only believers.

1. That infants are capable of some of the uses and ends with reference unto which Baptism is appointed. The truth of this will appear above any rational doubt, by the bare mentioning

tioning some of the uses and ends, of that Ordinance. Take only these two.

1. To seal confirm and ratify the Covenant with the Promises thereof, unto those with whom it is established : And.

2. To give those a solemn admission into the visible Church, who have an antecedent right thereunto : that these are two of the grand ends and uses of Baptism has been elsewhere proved, and is granted by our Author himself. Now that infants are capable of both these ends and uses of Baptism is past all rational doubt. If God has extended his Covenant to them, why may he not seal, confirm and ratify it unto them by an outward sign and token ? if it be his will they should have a place in his Church or Family, why may they not be solemnly admitted thereunto by Baptism ; But not to spend time in the proove of that which no body will or can deny. Therefore.

2. That Infants may be baptized, as capable of some, though it should be granted that they are incapable of other, of the ends and uses of Baptism ; this is secured, both by the acknowledgment of *our opposers themselves* and it's own light and evidence from any opposition, especially from them. *Our Authour* affirms (how truly may be seen after) That Circumcision was applyed to *Abraham* for such uses and ends of which none of his seed were capable, so both *Mr. Tombes* and himself (with what consistency with his own Principles *ipse viderit* :) acknowledge that Circumcision did represent and signify Heart-circumcision, which

it could no more do to Infants, then Baptism can Regeneration, yet that hindred not its application unto them: And if Circumcision, the former token of the Covenant might be applied to Infants as capable of some, though incapable of other ends and uses, with reference unto which it was appointed, why it may not be so with Baptism no rational account can be given: yea, though we set aside their respective reference to the Covenant as the Signs and Tokens thereof; if one Ordinance may be appointed for, and applyed to several Subjects with reference to several ends and uses, some of which all the Subjects are capable of, others only some of them, why may it not be so with any other Ordinance? But further; That our Lord Christ may appoint the application of Baptism to Infants, as capable of some of the ends and uses of it, though it should be granted they are not capable of others, is undeniable from the sole consideration of his sovereign Lordship over his owne house: It's true, could it be Proved that they are simply and absolutely incapable, of any of the ends and uses of Baptism, it were rational to conclude our Lord Christ had not appointed its application to them: But to grant that Infants are capable of some, yea the main and Principal Ends and uses of Baptism, and yet to argue against their Baptism meerly from their incapability of other ends and uses of it; as it is a wild way of arguing, so it not a little reflects upon the soverign Power and Authority of him from whose mouth it is the duty of all mortals to

wait for the Law. Will he appoint Baptism to be applied to them for such ends as they are capable of, though they should be incapable of others, who may say unto him, *what doest thou?*

5. The difference between the New and Old Testament-dispensation is urged as another Argument to prove that the Baptism of Beleivers is only Christs Ordinancce of Baptism. And there is a two-fold difference assigned by *our Author* between the Old and New Testament-dispensations. The first respects the Subjects, or Persons of whom the Church under the first Testament was, and under the New is constituted and made up: Under the first Testament they were, saies he, *the fleshy seed of Abraham*, whom he conceives might, and that as such without a personal work of Regeneration be admitted into, and continued then in the Church. Hence that Church was only *a Carnal Church*, as he speaks, *pag. 221.* But now the Subjects, or Persons of which the Church under the New Testament is and ought to be constituted and made up, are and ought to be *professed Beleivers*, and consequently visibly the *Spiritual Seed of Abraham.*

2. The other Difference he assigns between these two Dispensations respects the Worship, then and now to be tendred up unto God; Then he conceives the Worship both in respect of the Matter of it, and Meanes or outward Ordinances, in and by which it was to be performed, was sutable to the nature of the Church; as the Church was a Carnal Church, so the Worship was external, performed in and by carnal Ordinance: *They then,*

then, says he, *had a Worldly Sanctuary, Carnal Ordinances, a temporal Priesthood, and a multitude of Ceremonies*; but now under the New Testament, it is, says he, otherwise, *now the Worship is spiritual and the Ordinances are spiritual; and this worship must be offered up to God by an unchangeable Priesthood*. And hence he conceives, that however Infants might be admitted into the Church under the Old Testament, yet now they ought not: Now 'tis most meet and sutable, that only a spiritual Seed should attend the spiritual Worship, and spiritual Ordinances.

Ans. As for this Change made in the new Testament-dispensation, whereby it differs from the Old, as it respects the worship to be performed, whether in regard of the matter of it, or the Ordinances in and by which it is to be performed, how either Infants or their Baptism should be concerned in it, is impossible to imagine; they are as capable to the full of holding Communion with the Church now in spiritual Ordinances, and to offer up a spiritual worship by an unchangeable Priesthood, as they were to hold communion with that carnal Church, as *our Author* calls it, or to partake of those carnal Ordinances, or to worship God by that temporary Priesthood: That is, they neither were nor are capable of the one nor the other: And then how their Baptism or Church-membership, should be any way concerned in this change, *our Author* neither does nor can shew; neither can I well think that himself did think these things would signifie any thing to any rational man: But these terms and phrases of worldly Sanctuary, carnal Ordinances, &c. might

might excite passions in persons of weaker Judgments, and thereby his Cause might be somewhat promoted among such. And therefore that which we are here alone concerned in, is this change in the New Testament dispensation, whereby it differs from that under the Old Testament, as it respects the subjects or persons of which the Church then and now was and is to be constituted and made up of. And this we absolutely deny, that the New Testament dispensation does so differ as is here supposed from the Old: We absolutely deny that fleshly descent from *Abraham* was a sufficient ground for the admitting or continuing any in the Church under the Old Testament beyond his Children, immediately descending from his own loins: But the Church was then as now to be constituted, or to consist only of *Abraham's* spiritual or mystical seed inclusive of their Infants; and consequently that Church was a spiritual Church or Corporation as the Gospel Church is. We grant that a greater measure of the spirit, is granted to the Church, under the New Testament, than was under the Old; and answerably the true and sincere members have, or at least may have, spiritual life *in more abundance*, as our Lord Christ speaks, than the members of the Church ordinarily then had. But as then there were some hypocrites, so there is still: So as now the Church according to divine appointment, ought to consist of visible Believers, among whom some are sincere, so it was then. In a word, as there was a mixture of *Wheat and Chaff in the floor of Christ* then, so there is still: But the Church then, might and ought to

to be denominated a spiritual Church or House as it may and ought to be now. So that the New Testament dispensation, differs not at all from the Old; in regard of the matter or subjects the Church is constituted or made up of; they were then the spiritual seed of *Abraham*, including their Infants, and so they are still. This shall be further manifest when I come to the resolution of that question, Whether Circumcision was administered to Believers as Believers, and to their seed as such? But yet let me here offer these two Arguments to prove that the New Testament dispensation, does not so differ, in respect of the matter or subjects of the Church, from the Old, as is pretended.

1. If the same attributes may be, and are by the Holy Ghost himself, given to the Church, under the Old Testament, that may be and are given to the Church under the New, then the New Testament dispensation, as it respects the matter or subjects of the Church, does not so differ as is pretended from the Old: But the antecedent is true, therefore the consequent.

That the antecedent is true (*viz.*) that the same attributes, may be and are by the Holy Ghost himself given to the Church under the Old Testament, that may be and are given to the Church under the New, is undeniable, by comparing *Exod. 19. 5, 6.* with *1 Pet. 2. 9.* As the Church now is a *peculiar people unto God*; so it was then: As it is now a *royal Priesthood*; so it was then: As it is now an *holy Nation*; so it was then.

And from the Holy Ghost's thus giving the same attributes to the Church then; that are given to the Church now, it will undenyably follow,

low, that there is no such change made in the New Testament dispensation as is pretended. Can that Church be denominated a carnal Church any more than the Gospel-Church may, when it was a *peculiar people, a royal Priesthood, a holy Nation*, as well as the Church now is. But

2. If the Church under the first Testament was the mystical Body of Christ into which Believers under the New Testament are incorporated, and as so incorporated make up and continue the same mystical Body of Christ in the world; then the New Testament dispensation, as it respects the matter or subjects of the Church, does not differ as is pretended from the old: But the former is true, therefore the latter: The antecedent is undeniable from that *Ephes. 3. 6.* from whence the conclusion will necessarily follow. But of this more hereafter. From what has been said, we evidently see, there is no such change of dispensation as our Author supposes, and answerably this argument is of no force at all: And hence for what he after nonsensically talks of *John's* discharging that privilege of *Abraham's* natural seed that admitted into the old Church, from any such Rite in the New, it signifies nothing, be his meaning what it will: *John* did not discharge them from any privilege they afore had, only rectifies a mistake they afore lay under. But

6. Our Author endeavours to confirm believers Baptism to be the only true Baptism, from the constitution of the Primitive Churches, *They were,* says he, *framed not of ignorant Babes, but of professing men and women:* And this, as he judges, is further evidenced, *by the dedication of the Epistles*
Sent

sent to the Churches, as well as the contents of the same.

Ans. This Argument presupposes, and takes for granted, that which is by many, if not by most, denied (*viz*) That Infants either by Baptism are or at least immediately upon their Baptism ought to be admitted as members into particular Churches; hence it only concerns such as are of that persuasion. I shall only say these two things.

1. That Infants Baptism may be sufficiently proved, though that be, as surely it may very rationally be denied; hence unless *our Author* can prove, which he attempts not; (he is better at begging than proving; whence it may be said to him in the Poets words.

—— τοὶ μυθοὶ φίλοι ἄνεργοι εἰσιν.)

I was saying, unless he can prove that Infant-baptism does necessarily suppose, and require that they are either by or immediately upon their Baptism to be admitted as members into particular Churches, his Arguments signify just nothing at all.

2. Suppose we should grant him that, yet to say no more, his proofs are wholly insufficient: Infants might be admitted as members of particular Churches, notwithstanding what he saith concerning *the Order directed to in Christs Commission*, and what we read concerning *the Apostles observation of that direction; or the unconcernedness of Infants, both in the dedications and contents of the Epistles sent to the Churches.*

As for the Commission, and the Apostles Practice,

Office, I have already shewd the insufficiency of the one and the other, to prove believers to be the only true subjects of Baptism: I shall therefore only touch upon the unconcernedness of Infants in the dedication of the Epistles sent to the Churches, or in the Epistles themselves,

Unto which I would say, If *our Author* judged that that Argument to prove Infant-baptism, drawn from their federal holiness deserves the left hand, it being so lately, not above an hundred and twenty years ago, brought to light, he has no reason to be angry, if we give somewhat the less heed to this Argument, to disprove the Church members-ship of Infants, seeing it is as I suppose, of a much later date, and comes short of that Argument, in point of antiquity, not less than an hundred and eighteen years. But for the Argument it self, I would only ask *our Author* these two Questions,

1. Whether Infants were more concerned in the prophecies and writings of the Prophets, than Infants are in the Epistles written to the Church? yet they were members of the Church then.

2. Whether he supposes, that the Apostles would have exprest themselves, otherwise than they have, had Infants been members of the Churches? But not to waste time upon such trifles; by what has been said, (for I shall say no more than what I have done to his humane Authority which makes up his seventh Argument) I say we may see what poor grounds the Antipedobaptists have for their first assertion (*viz.*) that Believers Baptism is only Christ's Ordinance of Baptism. I proceed now to his second.

C H A P. III.

Wherein the Author's two First Particulars to disprove Infant-baptism are considered ; with reference unto which two things remarked ; a full Enquiry made, whether what silence may be truly predicated either of the Scripture or Antiquity, concerning that practice, does not more tend to its establishment than overthrow. The Affirmative fully proved.

THAT I may hasten to the vindication of those Scripture Grounds which Pedobaptists have laid for their judgment and practice from the attempts of our Author to raise, at least darken and obscure them, (which is that I principally intend) I shall take the two first Arguments or Considerations he hath laid down for the disproof of Infant-baptism together ; the former of which is drawn from the supposed total silence of the Scriptures ; the latter from the alike total silence of Antiquity about the practice.

This First Consideration he thus expresseth. *If Infant-baptism had been an appointment or ordinance of Jesus Christ, there would have been some precept, Command or example in Scripture to warrant the same : But inasmuch as the Scripture is so wholly silent therein, there being not one syllable to be found in all the New Testament about any such*

E

practice

practice, it may be concluded to be no Ordinance of Jesus Christ.

His second is thus exprest. *The next thing we shall make appear is, that as there was no Scripture Authority to enforce it, so there was no humane Authority to enjoin it till above four hundred years after Christ.* And in pursuance of this latter Argument, he undertakes not only to shew the silence of Antiquity as to this practice, but over and above to shew *the time when, the persons by whom, and the ends for which it was instituted and brought into the Church;* wherein had his success been proportionable to his confidence, he had done something considerable, and should (I dare boldly say) have had many hearty thanks from the most zealous assertors of Infant-baptism themselves; and indeed he had well deserved it: but (alas!) how hath he failed; and who can do that which is impossible to be done? Impossibilities will non-plus the wisest and ablest of men, let their diligence and industry be never so great; and therefore it hath been usually said, *Impossibilium nullus est conatus.* Wise men cease endeavours where impossibilities appear: But more directly to my purpose with reference to both these considerations, I shall first remark two things.

Secondly, Inquire, whether what may be truly said of the silence of the Scriptures and Antiquity about the practice supposed, do not make it vastly more probable, that Infants ought, than that they ought not to be Baptized.

First, That which I would remark is, how little *our Author* hath done for the promoting the Cause he hath engaged in; by all that he hath

said

said in pursuance of these two Arguments : As for the Scriptures, that they are so silent as he *not* pretends, hath been sufficiently evidenced elsewhere, and may be further shewed hereafter : As for his various quotations, whereby he would make his Reader believe, either that so many Paedobaptists have acknowledged the silence of the Scriptures ; or that so many have affirmed that the Adult alone were baptized in the first Ages of the Church : What regard is to be had to them may also appear from what hath been already said, and shall immediately be further considered. I shall therefore at present only a little review the account he gives us of the *time when, the persons by whom, and the ends for which,* the Baptizing of Infants was (*as he saith*) instituted and brought into the Church. And thus the whole account he gives us, we have comprised in about fourteen lines at the lower end of his 114 and the upper end of his 115 Pages, and 6 lines at the lower end of his 117 Page : in brief it is this : *It is true, saith he, towards the latter end of this Century* (that is the fourth Century) *it is said, that in some parts of Africa, they did Baptize children, and quotes the Magdeburgenses for it; and that some of the Greek Church did begin to approve of it.* Gregory Nazianzen is said to admit Infants to be Baptized in case of necessity. And then he further adds, Jerome is said to incline to it also, after Origen and Cyprian ; then in his 117. Page tells us, that, speaking of the Fifth Century, *that was the Age wherein Infant-Baptism did receive its sanction by the decrees of Popes and Councils:* Here's the All that our Au-

thor, after his utmost enquiry into Antiquity, can say about the *time when, and the persons by whom* Infant-baptism was Instituted. And how well he hath performed his great undertaking let all judge. As for *the time when* Infant-baptism had its first rise, he leaves us wholly in the dark; for though he talk at random of its being practised by some in *Africa* about the latter end of the fourth Century, yet himself grants it was practised long before that time: for he tells us before, (page 62.) that *Tertullian opposed himself by several arguments against some that affirmed Infant-baptism*. Secondly, he quotes both *Chrysostom* and *Austin*, who (as hath been before taken notice of) were contemporary with Pope *Innocent* and lived in that very age, wherein he would insinuate Infant-baptism received its first sanction, as affirming *that then it was the universal practice of the whole Church, and hath been so time out of mind*.

3. He himself intimates that both *Origen* and *Cyprian* did, if not practice, yet incline to it, for so are his words; *Jerome is said to encline to it, after Origen and Cyprian*: so that *Origen* and *Cyprian* did incline to it, and that they did not only incline to it but also practise it, is sufficiently evidenced by other hands. Yea,

4. Himself denies not that it was practised before, only saith, *there was no humane Authority to enjoin it till above four hundred years after Christ*. Which signifies just nothing. And

5. Let me add this one Observation more that *Pelagius*, in all his contests with *Austin* about Original sin, durst never deny Infant-baptism though

though it had highly subserved his interest to have done it; seeing that practice was made so great use of by *Austin* for the confirmation of the doctrine of Original sin opposed by him, and the reason is given by *Austin* himself: *Pelagianos non fuisse ausos negare Baptismum parvulorum quod viderint nimis aperte cum Ecclesiâ totâ pugnandum fuisse, si eum negarent:*

Se Gerhard de
Baptismo pag.
575.

An undeniable evidence that Infant-baptism was then universally practised, and had been so for ought what then appeared, from the Apostles days: For could he have proved that it had been an innovation, and not the practice of the Church from the Apostles days, he would undoubtedly have done it; his cause being so nearly concerned in it.

Now can *our Author*, or any others think, (nay doth he not expressly grant the contrary) that that could be the age wherein Infant-baptism had its first rise? So that we are yet for ought what *our Author* hath said, utterly at a loss about the time when it was instituted.

As for the persons by whom it was instituted, here we are at as great a loss, as we are at about the time. Indeed he tells us in some parts of *Africa*, they did Baptize Children; this was in the Fourth Century; but he tells us not who they were, and consequently the Authors of Infant-baptism are yet to seek; and besides, these were not the first that Baptized Children, as appears from what he saith of *Tertullian*: So that it is evident not only some among the Africans and some among the Greeks, but some among the Latins, yea the universal Church, and that before the Fourth

Century, did Baptize Children. And as for those Fathers, viz. Gregory, Nazianzen, and Jerome, as he doth not affirm them to be the inventors of Infant-baptism, only saith they inclined to it; so it is certain they were not, it being, as confessed by himself, the universal practice of the Church in their days: So that *our Author* himself is wholly at a loss about the time when, and the persons by whom Infant-baptism was instituted: We cannot therefore derive its original from men, we must say it is *from heaven and not of men.*

As for the end for which he supposeth it to be instituted, if he assign any, it is the taking away of Original sin. But seeing neither the time when, nor the person by whom it was introduced into the Church can be found, we may safely conclude it is no other than the Institution of Christ himself, and not brought in by men for any such End; only some through mistakes did in after ages attribute too much to it with reference to that end. From all, how little hath *our Author* said in pursuance of these two first arguments for the promotion of his Cause

Secondly, Let it be considered, how greatly he hath abused and wronged, as his Authors, so his Readers, himself and his cause, in what he hath said. He hath greatly abused his Authors, either in Fathering that upon them which they never said, or grossely perverting their words, contrary to what they Evidently declared to be their sense and meaning in them. This he tells us (Page 108.) *That it was the known Custom of the Primitive Church to Baptize the Adult, and*
them

them only, at least for the first ages, is fully attested by Eusebius, Beatus Rhenanus, &c. whereas not one of them, except Ludovicus Vives (of whom I have spoken before) say any such thing. As for Beatus Rhenanus hee either speaks of Heathens, or else his words declare, he was a man that spake either he knew not, or cared not what. Let their Testimonies be read as quoted by himself, Page 63. 68. 73. 79. and 88. They say indeed that the aged were or ought to be Baptized, (which no body denies) but they say not they only were Baptized. So for at least vastly the Major part of those he quotes, Pages 98. 99. and 101. as acknowledging that there is no command, precept, or example in the Scriptures for the Baptizing of Infants; whereas they only acknowledge that there is no express command or precept, that is a command or precept *in totidem verbis*, nor any express mention of any Infants being Baptized. This he wrests, and would have his reader believe, they acknowledged there is noe warrant from Scripto Baptize them. And what greater abuse or wrong can be done to any Authors, than thus grossely to prevert and wrest their words. Can any man think he had any true actual fear of God before his Eyes when he wrote these Pages? And by thus abusing and wronging his Authors, he hath greatly wronged his Reader, himself and his owne cause; so that whereas he boasteth in his 107. and 108. Pages what he had gained by his learned Authorities; the Truth is, he hath only gained such a blot to his one reputation, as (unless publick repentance be manifested)

will never be wiped off in this world ; however (supposing him to have the truth of Grace) he may obtain Pardon hereafter. And how highly injurious hath he been to the cause he pleads: for Will not his Book remain as a publick Evidence of the Forgeries , Falsties, unjust and injurious dealings, the opposers of Infant-baptism are forced (for want of any Scripture or rational ground) to make use of, for the upholding and maintaining their Opinion and Practice. And the truth is, had I not some reason to think the Author is real in what he pleads for, I should much suspect him to be

* *Tuta frequens
que via est sub A.
vici falere nomen.* no Friend * to the Anabaptists ; be-
sure he hath given a sore wound
to their cause. But.

Secondly, Let us briefly inquire, whether what may be truly said of the silence of the Scriptures and Antiquity about Infant Baptism, doe not make it vastly more probable that they ought, than that they ought not to be Baptized, This I might greatly enlarge upon, but let only these Five things be well weighed.

First, That in case it had been the will of our Lord Christ that the Covenant-interest of the Infant-seed of his people should have been discontinued, and the application of the token of the Covenant unto them on that ground ceased ; it had been, if not absolutely necessary, yet exceeding useful to his Church, that he should have expressly and plainly declared it: How many Considerations offer themselves to Evidence this, let this only be observed; That no alteration ought to be made in or
about

about the Covenant beyond what our Lord Christ himself hath made: Hence had he not declared his will, that Females as well as Males should be Baptized, we had had no ground for their Baptism. So on the other hand, seeing he hath not declared his will that the Covenant-interest of, and the application of the token thereof unto the Infant-seed of his people should cease, we ought not to deny them the one or the other. Suppose the new Testament had been wholly silent about the will of Christ relating to Infants, (which yet it is not) we ought wholly to have guided our Judgments and practice relating unto them, by the first Establishment of the Covenant with *Abraham* the Father of the Faithfull; where we Evidently finde the natural seed, and that as such, both of *Abraham*, and all that were according to the true intendment of the Promise to be accounted for his seed, received into the same Covenant, and had the same token applyed to them with their Parents. And who could without hazard of subjecting themselves to his displeasure, make any alteration or change in the Tenour of the Covenant or any thing relating thereunto, beyond what our Lord Christ himself hath made?

Secondly, Let it be seriously considered, how utterly improbable it is, that an alteration of such a vast importance could have been made, unless the will of our Lord Christ had been expressly declared, without some opposition made by the unbelieving Jews, or some doubts and scruples arising in the minds of Believers, especially the converted Jews, about it. Whoso shall attentively

tively read over the sacred records relating to the New Testament-times, and consider what doubts did arise in the minds of Believers about, yea, what opposition was made by them, as well as by the unbelieving Jews, against changes of a vast lower importance, will hardly think this to carry the least or lowest degree of probability in it. Were they so tenacious of the distinction of Days and Meats, and would they so easily part with the Covenant-interest of their Chidren? Were they so hardly brought to part with Circumcision itself, though they had Baptism substituted in the room and stead thereof? And yet would they without any difficulty at all comply with, not only the taking away the token from their Children, but their interest in the Covenant and Promises also, without the substitution of any other privilege in leiu thereof: *Credat Appella*; for my own part I cannot do it.

Thirdly, Let it be further considered, that there is no error or erronious practice introduced into the Church, but it may be traced up to its first rise, at least the time may be shewed from Antiquity, when it was not in being in the Church. This the Lord *Brookes* and others have taken notice of; what a worthy account *our Author* hath given us of the rise of Infant-baptism hath been already declared; neither is it possible for any to give a better than himself hath done. But

Fourthly, Consider yet further, that the very first mention we have in Antiquity, of any doubts or debates relating to Infant-baptism does plainly imply, and presuppose it to have been antecedently

dently practised. Let *our Author* or any other produce the first mention that is made of any thing of that nature in Antiquity. I doubt not but it will be made evident, that that does presuppose the practice thereof to be in use before that time.

Fifthly, Let it yet be considered, that the first that we find to have spoken or written any thing with a direct reference to the practising of Infant-baptism, was to advise and perswade to the deferring of it. As for *Justin Martyr*, and *Irenæus*, though they let fall such passages as may be at least a probable ground to believe that it was the practice of the Church in their days, yet they wrote not directly either for, or against it.

And as for *Cyprian*, what he wrote about it to *Fidus*, did only relate to the time of its administration, whether it might be administered before the eighth day or no. So that *Tertullian* seems to be the first that wrote with a direct reference to the practice it self. From whence we may rationally conclude, that before *Tertullian* arose, the Church had continued from the Apostles days in the universal practice of Infant-baptism. That he found it the general practice of the Church is evident from that kind of opposition he makes against it; and nothing appears as the least intimation that it was not universal; for he wrote nothing against the lawfulness of the practice, but only perswades by several considerations, (such as they are) to deferr it.

And here we might again take notice how grossly *our Author* abuseth both *Tertullian*, and the *Magdeburgenses*, as relating *Tertullian's* opinion,

nion, he abuseth both in two things.

First, In saying they, that is the *Magdeburgenses*, tell us, that *Tertullian* did oppose himself against some that asserted Infant-baptism, whereas they only say (having given an account of *Cyprian's* resolution of the question sent him from *Fidus*, viz. that Infants might be baptized immediately or presently after they were born, *mox postquam editi*) that *Tertullian* thought otherwise, *Contra quod tamen Tertullianus censuit in libro de baptismo*: So that as he did not, so they do not say that he did, oppose himself against any, only was of a different judgement from *Cyprian* as to to the time of baptizing Infants.

Secondly, *Our Author* grossly abuseth both, by pretending that they tell us that *Tertullian* opposed himself against Infant-baptism absolutely; whereas they only tell us, that *Tertullian* said the differring of Baptism was more profitable according to the Condition, Disposition, and Age of all persons, especially Infants. Their words are *pro cujusque inquit, viz. Tertullianus, personæ, Conditione, Dispositione, etiam Ætate cunctatio baptismi utilior est, præcipuè tamen circa parvulos*. So that *Tertullian* only advileth to delay the baptism of Infants, and that not only theirs, but of all other unmarried persons.

The next that wrote any thing directly with reference to the practising of Infant-baptism, seems to have been *Gregory Nazianzen* (whom *our Author* again together with the *Magdeburgenses* grossly abuseth, (as almost which of his Authorities that he cites in favour of his cause, doth he not) and it may seem he was at least in part of

Tertullian's mind, yet withal affirms, that *omni ætati Baptisma convenire, that Baptism doth agree to every age*: And from the opinion of these two men probably it was that some Children of believing parents had their Baptism deferred, of which *our Author* makes so great use. But that is by the way. Now let all men judge whether what silence may be truly spoken of the Scriptures and Antiquity do not make it somewhat more than probable, that Infant-baptism was the universal practice of the Church in the Apostles days and the ages immediately succeeding: It had been, if not simply and absolutely necessary, yet exceeding useful that our Lord Christ should have plainly declared that his will about the discontinuing the Covenant-interest of the seed of his people, and the cessation of the application of the token of the Covenant to them on that account, had it been indeed his will that the one should have been discontinued, and the other left off; but no such declaration can be found. How unlikely that such a privilege should be withdrawn from the people of God, and no scruple arise in any mens minds about it, nor one Scribe, Pharisee, or unbelieving Jew, so much as taking the least notice of it, or improving it as an argument against the imbracement of the doctrine of Christ.

No man can be found as the first inventor of this practice of Infant-baptism; the first mention of it in Antiquity implying, that then it was in use, yea the general practice of the Church. The first that wrote any thing with a direct reference to the practising of it, only useth some frivolous reasons

reasons to perswade to the delay of it, neither opposing that practice as unlawful, nor so much as taking the least notice of the novelty of it, or of the practice of the Church to be otherwise. Now can any rational man imagine in case Infant-baptism (as *our Author* pretends) had been hardly yet in use, only asserted by some few in order to the future practice of it, that *Tertullian*, who it seems did somewhat dislike it, would have only perswaded to the deferring of it, and that by such inconsiderable reasons; and not rather set himself directly and downright against the practice it self, and that as an innovation unheard of hitherto in the Church; he could not be ignorant what the practice of the Church had been.: And had he known that the universal practice of the Church had been to baptize the Adult only, he would undoubtedly have urged that, if not as the only, yet as a main argument against it, or at least as a main motive to perswade to the deferring of it. But when such a man as *Tertullian* was, (who so fully vnderstood the affairs of the Church, not only in his own days, but in the ages past) shall only advise to the delay of Infant-baptism, and that too only as more profitable, and not at all either oppose the practice as unlawful, or so much as take the least notice of the practice of the Church in baptizing the Adult only, it is to me (what it may be to others I cannot say) little less than a full demonstration that Infant-baptism was then the known and approved practice of the Church, yea and had been so from the Apostles time. Surely a man that is not a stranger to all principles of Reason had need

of some very cogent arguments to satisfy himself that Infant-baptism was not practised either in the Apostles days, or in the ages immediately ensuing. But to proceed

C H A P. IV.

Wherein his third Particular for the disproving of Infant-Baptism is considered: In what sense Tradition is laid by us as a ground of Infant-Baptism declared: That ground in the sense in which it is laid by us, vindicated from Mr. Danvers his attempts to overthrow it.

THirdly, the supposed erroneous grounds both as to fabulous Traditions, and mistaken Scriptures; upon which the practice of Infant-baptism hath been both formerly and laterly founded, is brought by our Author as his third argument or consideration to disprove the practice thereof.

Ans. As for the former ground, viz. Tradition, upon which he saith the practice of Infant-Baptism hath been both formerly, and laterly founded, I shall not spend much time in the vindication of it; only I might here again detect his disingenuity and unworthy dealing, yea downright falsities and untruths. Thus he most disingeniously and falsely affirms, that the first and principal ground that hath been laid for this practice, hath been Ecclesiastical and Apo-

Apostolical Tradition; and I doubt not but he thought the very name of a Tradition would considerably advantage his Cause; those that will but attentively read his own Book, must have a very great Charity for him not to believe that he affirms this contrary to his own knowledge. For

First, himself acknowledgeth, that the 19. *Mat. 14. was of old called the Scripture-Canon for Infant-Baptism*, Page 177; so again Page 260.

Secondly, he knows full well that Circumcision was frequently pleaded for it.

Thirdly, he knows *Austin* denies it to be a Sacrament without the word of Institution, Page 103.

Lastly, he cannot but know how these Fathers understood the word Tradition. See Doctor *Ames* his first Book, sixth Chapter, Page 67. *de Verbo Dei*, where he sheweth how the Ancients used this term Tradition, quoting that known passage out of *Cyprian*, *Si aut in Evangelio præcipitur, aut Apostolorum Epistolis, aut actibus, continetur, observatur certè hæc sancta traditio*. But this is *ad hominem, non ad rem*. I shall therefore pass it by, and only shew how far Infant-Baptism is founded upon Tradition, and then take a brief account in one particular instance, how *our Author* hath acquitted himself in razing this Foundation, as he calls it, of Infant-Baptism. For the first, and thus we constantly affirm, that the Scriptures are only and alone in a proper sense the ground and foundation of our Faith and Practice in matters relating to the Worship of God; the whole Faith

faith and practice of the Church as such ought to be resolved into, and grounded upon the Scriptures; * and consequently the only proper ground upon which this practice in special hath been, and is founded by all Orthodox and sound Divines are the Scriptures: And answerably we take in Tradition (by which we understand no more than the discoveries that have been made in and by the Church, whether doctrinally or practically of the descent of this practice from the times of Christ and his Apostles to our dayes) as a subordinate means, whereby we come to know, and are more fully confirmed that it was indeed established by Christ and his Apostles, and contained in the Doctrine of the Gospel. Neither do we say that this Tradition is the principal means whereby we come to know this: But the principal means are, the Scriptures themselves, as compared one with another; this is only a subordinate means; so that the practice we plead for is founded upon Tradition, but in a very inferior way, *viz.* as that is a subordinate means whereby we come to know, and be more fully assured that it is according to the will of Christ revealed in his word. But

* *Sunt Scriptura
prima veritas re-
velata, sicut De-
us est prima ve-
ritas revelans.*

Secondly, let us see whether *our Author* hath rendred this ground wholly disserviceable, as to the use we make of it; whether he hath sufficiently proved that all traditional Testimonies (as he speaks) produced by us for the establishment of the practice under debate, be indeed fabulous and fictitious, as he pretends. And here I shall

only single out the testimony that the Epistle of *Cyprian* to *Fidus* gives, as to the practice of Infant-Baptism in his days, and see whether it may not be as much regarded and leaned to after he hath said the utmost he can, as it might before; yea whether it might not before, and consequently still be greatly regarded, and safely leaned upon, so far as humane Authority may be leaned upon. And as previous hereunto, it must be observed how subtilly *our Author* endeavours to conceale the main, yea in effect the whole of the Evidence given in by that Epistle for our assurance, that Infant-Baptism was then the universal practice of the Church. This appears thus:

Whereas one *Fidus* a Minister having written to *Cyprian* to give him his judgment, whether the eighth day was not alike to be observed by Christians as the time for the Application of Baptism to Infants, as it was of old for the Application of Circumcision? *Cyprian* assembleth 66 Bishops to debate that Question: They all unanimously agree, that no such observation ought to be made, but that Infants might lawfully be baptized, *mox postquam editi, immediately after they were born*: Hereupon *Cyprian* writes back to *Fidus*, giving him an account of his own and their Judgments in that particular. Now from hence we infer three things.

First, that Infant-Baptism was then generally practised.

Secondly, that it had been so time out of mind.

Thirdly, that in as much as they lived so near the

the Apostles days, it must most probably be the practice of their times. And that which we ground these inferences upon is this, *viz.* That neither *Fidus*, nor *Cyprian*, and those 66 Bishops with him, did at all question the lawfulness of Infant-Baptism; the former only questioning, the later only determining about the precise time of its application.

Now it seems altogether irrational to imagine, that so many on the one hand, and on the other should not rather question the practice it self, than the time of its administration, in case it had not been the general practice of those, yea of the Apostles times; seeing they cannot be rationally supposed, unacquainted with what was the practice of the Church even in their days. *Cyprian*, and consequently those other Bishops contemporary with him, flourished about the year 240, or 250. and consequently about eighty years after the death of *Policarp*, who was one of the Apostle *John's* Hearers and Disciples, for he was martyred in the fourth Persecution under *Decius* the Emperor, which was in the year 168.

Now can it be imagined that so many Bishops could possibly be ignorant of what was the practice of the Church in the Apostles days, so nigh unto which they lived; or can it be imagined, that had they known Infants were not baptized in their days, there should only arise a doubt among them about the time of its application, and none about the practice it self. But these things *our Author* thought meet to conceal, and carry on his Discourse, as though the scruple

had been about the practice it self. And from what hath been said it evidently appears, that the only question relating to this Epistle of *Cyprian* is this, *viz.* Whether this Epistle were indeed written by *Cyprian* or no? whether *Fidus* did write to him for satisfaction in that case? And whether he wrote back to him that Epistle wherein he declares his own; and those Sixty six Bishops judgements about the question proposed to *Fidus*? And hence *our Authors* first consideration to enervate this testimony of *Cyprian* signifies nothing at all; inasmuch as *Cyprian* medleth not at all with the practice it self, but takes the lawfulness of that for granted, as having been the universal practice of the Church in and since the Apostles days, and only determines the time when Baptism may be applied to Infants.

As for his second Consideration, which alone is of any weight, *viz. that there is good ground as he saith to question whether this was Cyprian's and these Sixty six Bishops conclusion*, we shall easily discover the vanity of it. Let us therefore see the grounds he hath to question that.

First, His first Ground is, *because we meet with no such Council, nor doth it appear where it was held.*

To which I would say three things.

First, that the Ancients did generally, yea universally for ought it appears to the contrary, own and acknowledge this to be *Cyprians* Epistle, and consequently that there was such a Council held,

held, though the place where is not exprest. This appears by their frequent citing of it, and for us who live so many hundred years after them, to call it into question upon this ground, when they did not, is irrational.

Secondly, That there was such a Council or Synod (for it is exprest sometimes by the one term, sometimes by the other) and that it was held in *Africa*, (though the particular town or place where be not exprest,) is expressly declared by the *Magdeburgenses*, Century the third, *Chap. 9. pag. 205.*

Thirdly, Some affirm it was held at *Carthage*.

His second Ground is, *because the grounds upon which the Conclusion is grounded are so weak.*

Ans. All the Grounds are not so weak and frivolous as our Author pretends; but how weak soever, yet not more weak than *Tertullian's*, by which he perswades to the deferring of Baptism, and yet these are lookt upon by our Author as considerable; and whoso is acquainted with the Fathers, will find somewhat of weakness in the reasonings of the most noted among them.

Thirdly, His third Ground is, *because it is a doctrine so much contradicted by his great Master Tertullian, whom he so much revered.*

Ans. *Tertullian* doth not absolutely oppose

Infant-baptism, only adviseth to deferr it as more profitable: Hence this doctrine doth not absolutely contradict *Tertullian*; but suppose it did, 'tis no wonder though *Cyprian* contradict *Tertullian* in that wherein he dissented from the judgement and practice of the universal Church.

Fourthly, His last Ground is this, *because other things have been Father'd upon him which were none of his.* This is so far from being a ground to question whether this Epistle was *Cyprian's* or no, that it doth strongly argue it was his: Inasmuch as in case it had not been his, it would have been somewhere discovered as those other things Father'd upon him are. From all which we see how little ground *our Author* hath, or any others have to question the truth and genuineness of this Epistle; and supposing the truth and genuineness of it; it is past all rational doubt that Infant-baptism was the known and approved practice of the primitive times. And I am bold to say, and doubt not but to make it good, if needful; that this one Epistle of *Cyprian*, gives greater evidence that Infant-baptism was practised in the primitive times, than all the Authorities *our Author* hath produced give against it. So that this first Ground (as he calls it) of Infant-baptism lies firm, and is as serviceable to the use we put it to, as ever it was, notwithstanding he hath wearied, yea I may say wounded and bruised himself so much in his attempts to raze or remove it. But

C H A P. V.

A Vindication of the Scripture-grounds of Infant-baptism entred upon. Two Things remarked, with reference to the Opposition made against the Argument drawn from their Federal Holiness : The Arguments drawn from the Covenant considered. Three of the principal with reference to that Covenant proposed. The unsoundness of Mr. Danvers Resolutions of them evidenced : The true Resolutions of them given.

SEcondly, to proceed to the other ground, viz. Scripture Authority, upon which Infant-baptism is founded, and this is that we are principally concern'd in. Suppose he hath (which yet he is far short of) rendred the ground of Tradition utterly unserviceable, and of no use to us; yet if the ground of Scripture Authority lie firm, the practice we have founded thereupon stands sure. But here again I shall not spend time in the vindication of all those Scriptures that our Author hath thought meet to bestow his pains in rendring useless unto us. He hath it seems judged it highly conducing to the furtherance of his cause to attack where he foresaw his conquest sure; though he could not but know

that (excepting in the judgment of such who conceit the cause is gained when a Scripture is baffled, that however made use of by some, yet really is impertinent to the question in controversie) neither our cause is prejudiced, nor his promoted thereby. I shall only remark one or two things with reference to the opposition he makes against that argument Pedobaptists make use of, drawn from the federal holiness of the seed of believing Parents, grounded upon 1 Cor. 7. 14. for the establishing the practice of Infant-baptism, and come to what I principally intend.

First, It may be observed, of how little advantage to *our Authors* cause, that weighty observation is (for so I suppose he conceives it to be) that he hath made, or rather taken up from Mr. *Tombes*, concerning the antiquity of this argument. His words are these, speaking of this argument, *of which Zuinglius about one hundred and twenty Years since, for as much as I can learn, was the first founder, wherein he was singular from all that went before him.* With reference unto which let these few things be observed.

I. That it may be shrewdly suspected that he grossly belies his own knowledge, denyes himself to be able to *learn* what he cannot, (supposing him as well read in Authors as he pretends) but know. For

I. Mr. *Marshal* (whom doubtless he hath read) in his answer to Mr. *Tombes*, shews him that the Ancients were not wholly strangers to the federal holyness of the Infant-seed of Believers, and instanceth in *Athanasius* and *Tertullian*, the one a Greek, and the other a Latine Author; and
Gerard,

Gerard Tom. 4. *Pag.* 593. instanceth in two more, viz. *Austin* and *Jerome*, interpreting this very text to the same sence, though it shall be granted that *Austin* in one of his *Epistles* was of another mind. But

2. Our Author himself elsewhere grants, (as is before observed) that that Text in *Matth.* 19. *ver.* 14. was so commonly urged for Infant-baptism, that it bore the title of the Scripture-canon for that practice; and he cannot but know that Circumcision was frequently urged for the establishment of the same practice. And can *our Author* or any one else imagine that learned men, having so great acquaintance with the Scriptures as they had, should affirm Infants to belong to the kingdom of heaven, and yet know nothing of their Interest in the Covenant of Grace, by vertue of which they can only belong thereunto. Or can any think that they understood not, that Circumcision was a token of the Covenant, and answerably was applied to Infants as such? It is plain they did: *Austin* in his Fourth Book concerning Baptism, *Chap.* 24. determines that the Sacrament of Circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of Faith to *Isaac*, even in his infancy when he was but eight days old. So *Cbrysostom* and *Theophilaet* cited by *our Author* himself, affirmed it with the Apostle, to be a seal of the righteousness of Faith; which righteousness is undoubtedly one of the blessings promised in the Covenant of Grace. And hence it cannot be rationally supposed, but that they must apply Baptism to Infants under the same notion under which Circumcision was applied to them of old.

Would

Would they plead for Baptism from Circumcision, unless they took it for granted that Infants still had the same ground for Baptism, *viz.* interest in the Covenant, that the Infant-seed of the Jews had for Circumcision. Now the federal holiness of Infants that we plead for, and make one ground of their Baptism is the same thing exprest in other words with their Covenant interest, or state, at least is the immediate result of it. But

2. Can it be any advantage to his, or prejudice to our cause that some arguments have been found out of late, beyond what have been formerly made use of. I suppose *our Author* will not think the cause he pleads for is prejudiced by any thing he hath brought to light, *de novo*.

3. That it is the strength of Arguments, not the Antiquity or Authors of them; that the cause is concern'd in: Hence if this be a valid Argument, it matters not who was the first Author of it. But

2. I must remark his confident assertion, *pag. 198.* where saith he, speaking still of this Argument, *we have two things asserted, but not at all proved*: What those things are he tells us.

First, That the holyness in the text is meant of federal holyness.

Secondly, That federal holyness qualifies for Baptism.

Neither of these, saith he, *is at all proved*. Had he said not sufficiently or satisfactorily proved, it had argued some modesty; but, not at all proved, is too high for one no better skill'd in Argumentation, than for what appears in his Book he is.

Whether

Whether what *our Author* hath said, be of more force to disprove, than what others, especially *Mr. Baxter* hath said to prove, that this same federal holiness is intended in the text, I shall refer to the judgement of all unbyassed and unprejudiced men; and come to what I more especially aim at, and that is to vindicate those Arguments drawn from the Covenant as established with *Abraham* and his seed in their Generations, for the confirmation of the practice we plead for, from the attempts *our Author* hath made to invalidate them.

And that the Reader may more clearly see how we infer and conclude Infant-baptism from the Covenant as so established, he must carefully observe and remember four things.

First, That we distinguish between the Covenant-interest, or (as it is usually call'd) federal holiness of the Infant-seed of Believers, and their right to Baptism.

Secondly, That it is their Covenant-interest that we principally contend for, and design the proof of, from the Covenant at first established with *Abraham* the Father of the faithful.

Thirdly, That we plead not for Infant-baptism merely from the Analogy it bears with or to Circumcision, as though the Analogy between them were a sufficient ground of the application of Baptism to Infants, as *our Author* would bear men in hand that we do.

Fourthly, Though we judge it a very rational supposal, that the application of the token of the Covenant should be as extensive under the New Testament, as it was under the old: Yet do we
not

not ground our practice merely upon that supposal, but upon the command obliging *Abrahams* seed in their Generations to keep the Covenant, that is the token of the Covenant. And hence we say that Infant-baptism may be sufficiently proved from the Covenant so far as we design the proof of it therefrom, as made with *Abraham* and his seed in their Generations; though little consideration be had of Circumcision. Whence it is but a subtil insinuation to prejudicate the minds of unwary Readers to talk of our Arguments from Circumcision; it is not from Circumcision, but from the Covenant that we plead for Infant-baptism. Hence the Resolution of these four questions is necessary and sufficient for the discovering whether Infant-baptism may, or may not be truly inferred and concluded from the Covenant as now establish'd with *Abraham*.

First, Whether the New or Gospel Covenant, and this mentioned *Gen. 17.* be one and the same? Or more plainly, whether the New Covenant, the Covenant under the New Testament administration, under which Believers are; be not the same with that mentioned *Gen. 17. 7*?

Secondly, Whether the Infants of *Abraham* and his seed, and that as such were not included and comprehended in this Covenant, and that both in the promissory and preceptive part of it?

Thirdly, Whether Circumcision was the token, sign, or seal of the Covenant both to Parents and Children?

Fourthly, Whether Baptism be not the token, sign, or seal of the Covenant under the Gospel administration?

The satisfactory resolution of these questions would be sufficient for the discovery of the mind and will of God relating unto Baptism, so far as it is held forth unto us in the Covenant, as at first established with *Abraham* and his seed in their Generations. For if so be it be indeed certain, that the Covenant believers are now under, be the same with that establish'd with *Abraham*, and the Infants both of *Abraham* and his seed, and that as such; were included and comprehended in the Covenant, both in the promissory and preceptive part of it: and consequently as the promise so the command concerning the application and bearing of the token of the Covenant did tend to and concern them: And that Circumcision was the sign, token, or seal of the Covenant both to Parents and Children, and Baptism doth now succeed in the place, room, and use of Circumcision in that general notion and consideration, as a sign or token of the Covenant; then past all rational doubt, according to the true intendment of God in this Covenant, Infants ought to be baptized, as of old they were circumcised. But if these or any of these things be not so, but are mere mistakes on our part, I shall confess, we have no sure footing for the practice of Infant-baptism in the Covenant, as at first establish'd with *Abraham* and his seed in their Generations. But seeing *our Author* hath judged it more conducing to his cause to tread in a different path, I must follow him in that, and see what he hath gained by his so doing; with this proviso, that I shall more lightly touch upon these questions wherein the practice in controversie is less; and more enlarge

large upon those wherein it is more neerly concerned. His

First Particular or Enquiry is, *whether Circumcision call'd the Gospel Seal, did of old belong to all in Gospel Covenant.* This he resolves in the Negative, and gives us two reasons of that his resolution.

First, *Because some that were in the Gospel Covenant were not sealed.*

Secondly, *Because some that were out of the Covenant were sealed therewith.*

Ans. This question but little (if at all) concerns the main question in controversie; so that should his resolution prove right, we are not hurt thereby: And the reason is evident, *viz.* because we ground Infant-baptism upon their Covenant-interest, arising from their relation to such Parents who are to be accounted *Abraham's* seed, considered in conjunction with the command obliging all his seed in their Generations, (*i. e.*) both they and their Children to keep the Covenant, (*i. e.*) the token of the Covenant. Hence unless *our Author* prove, (which he attempts not) that Circumcision did not belong to all *Abraham's* seed in their Generations, including, as before, Parents and their Infants, and consequently that there were some Infants, who though the Children of such Parents as were to be accounted *Abraham's* seed, yet neither had any interest in the Covenant, nor were to be circumcised.

His instances of persons in Covenant who were not circumcised, and of persons out of Covenant who were circumcised, (supposing it were so as he saith) signifie nothing to his purpose. Let

God

God dispose of his own institutions as himself pleaseth. Let us mind our own duties: Now this is evident, that as *Abraham's* seed in their generations are under the promise that God will be a God unto them; so they are under the command that they in their generations do keep the Covenant (*i e*) the token of the Covenant. Let *our Author* either prove that Infants were not included with their Parents either in the promises, or in the command concerning the application of the token of the Covenant, or else that Circumcision ought not to be applyed to all included in the Covenant, otherwise he saith nothing to purpose. Therefore

Secondly, Whether the New or Gospel Covenant and that mention'd *Gen. 17.* be one and the same ?

Ans. In resolving this question *our Author* speaks warily and indeed gives no resolution at all, but leaves his Reader in the dark. I suppose he knew that to have absolutely denyed, that the Covenant here mention'd is one and the same with the New Covenant under which Believers now are, had involved him in inextricable difficulties; and yet to have affirmed that they are one and the same, had given a shrewd blow to his cause. Hence he judgeth it meet, only to cast a mist before his Readers eyes by needless and impertinent distinctions about a double capacity that *Abraham* stood in, and two different sorts of promises made to him. But how those distinctions conduce any thing to satisfie the Reader about the question put, he declares not. So that the Reader must needs remain at the same uncertainty

tainty, whether that Covenant, and the New Covenant be one and the same, or whether they are two distinct Covenants, that he was at before. It is true he instanceth in several promises, and among the rest, one in the fifth Verse of this Chapter, which is made personally to *Abraham*, and wherein none of his Seed have any part with him; and pretends to mention another, that he saith, *in an especial manner belongs* (a dark and doubtful expression) *to the New Covenant*. I say pretends, because it is uncertain, whether there be not a mistake in the Printer, putting the eighth Verse for the seventh; though I very much suspect there is not, and if not so, he wholly passeth by the Covenant, or that promise in the seventh Verse, about which the main and proper question between our opposers and us is mainly (if not only) concerned. Seeing there is no such promise as he mentions in that Verse he points to, it can be but a pretence merely to blind the eyes of his Reader, and lead him blindfold through this Question; the right determination of which is of such vast importance for the clearing up the main Question in controversie between us.

To the next question, which he judged he could give a more plausible answer to, without exposing himself to any such inconveniencies as a plain down-right Answer to this would have done; and if there be a mistake, the eighth Verse being put for the seventh; then we have the full of what we desire: But seeing *our Author* hath thought it convenient thus to divert from the question, himself proposed, I
would

would desire him, (if ever he write again) plainly and distinctly to resolve these two or three questions, absolutely necessary for the unfolding this dark and confused Discourse, that he pretends as a full resolution of this question.

First, whether this Covenant mentioned in the seventeenth of *Genesis*, were made with *Abraham* as a Natural, or as a Spiritual Father, or considered in both these capacities? We say as considered in both; upon what ground he may see in my Infant-Baptism from Heaven, Page the seventh and eighth.

Secondly, to what Covenant these promises that he mentions as made to *Abraham* as a Natural Father, with respect to his Natural Seed, did belong? Did they belong to the Covenant of Works, or (as some call it) the Covenant of Nature? or was there any other Covenant aforemade with *Abraham*, unto which they did belong? or did they belong to no Covenant at all? We say they belonged to the Covenant of Grace, or New Covenant, though some of them at least were indefinite promises made to his Seed in general; not definite, made to any individuals of his Seed; or (as others express it) they were promises, not of the essence of, only appendices to the Covenant. And the reason is, because we judge them to be Covenant-Mercies, and can find no other Covenant they can with any shew of reason be supposed to appertain unto. If our Author will help us out here, he shall have hearty thanks for his pains.

Thirdly, whether it was a mistake of the Printer, in putting down the eighth Verse for

the seventh, or no? If it was not, (as I suppose he will be unwilling (for reasons he knows) to grant, that this promise in the seventh Verse doth belong to the New Covenant, or Covenant of Grace, under which Believers are, under the New Testament) I would ask him, or any other man that is *Compos mentis*, whether the promise of the Land of *Canaan* in the former part of the eight Verse, and the promise of God's being their God in the latter part of the same Verse, were not made to the same persons? Let the words be but read. *And I will give unto thee, and unto thy Seed after thee the Land wherein thou art a Stranger, all the Land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God.* Now ask but any Child that hath learned his Accidence; what is the Antecedent to, *their*? Surely he will presently reply, *thy Seed*, mentioned in the former part of the Verse, unto whom the promise of the Land of *Canaan* is made.

Now then these two promises as thus connected and made joyntly to the same persons, they must needs belong to one and the same Covenant; which being granted, as infallibly it will by all that have any regard to what they say; I would ask any man, whether they do think they belong to the Covenant mentioned Verse the seventh or no? Did I think it were necessary, I should add something to prove that they do.

Now then, let things be laid together, and seriously weighed: That the promise of God's being a God to *Abraham's* Seed mentioned in the eighth Verse

Verse belongs to the Covenant of Grace, is positively asserted by *our Author*. That the promise of the Land of *Canaan*, and this promise were made to the same Seed is undeniable, and that both these promises belong to one and the same Covenant is as undeniable as the former. And yet further, that the Covenant they belong to is that mentioned Verse the seventh, is as much above any rational question as either. Now he acknowledgeth, that the promise of the Land of *Canaan* was made to *Abraham* with respect to his Natural Seed; and from all it will appear, even from what *our Author* himself acknowledgeth, as though written with the Beams of the Sun, that the Covenant mentioned *Genesis* the seventeenth, and the seventh, is the Covenant of Grace, or the New Covenant; the same with that Believers are now under, and that this Covenant was made with *Abraham* as a Natural, as well as a Spiritual Father, with respect to his Natural as well as his Spiritual Seed; and so we have both this and the next question answered together. And yet further, that the Covenant mentioned Verse the seventh, established with *Abraham* and his Seed in their Generations, is not only a Covenant of Grace; but the Covenant of Grace, under which Believers in New Testament times are, is sufficiently made out elsewhere; and indeed is so evident from that Discourse of the Apostle in the third to the *Galatians*, that it is to admiration how any man can pretend to own the Writings of the Apostles, and yet question it. That he hath refe-

Infant-Baptism
from Heaven,
Page 191, 192.

rence, Verse the sixteenth, to this Covenant is past all doubt, in as much as there is no other promise exprest in these terms, *to thy Seed*, (wherein the very strength of the Apostles Argument lies) but only this: And that the Covenant in which that promise is contained was never disannulled; but is that Covenant according to which Believers enjoy all the blessings of the Gospel, is as evident as any thing in the World can be made by words, as is sufficiently shewed in the forementioned Discourse. So that I need add no more; only I shall say that the promise, *Genesis* the seventeenth, seventh Verse, doth not only belong to the Covenant of Grace under which Believers still are, but is the very sum and substance of it, as to God's part; and our opposers shutting their eyes against the Scripture-Light evidencing the Truth hereof, is one special cause of their falling into, and continuing in that Errour they so pertinaciously maintain.

But to proceed; *What Seed of Abraham it is to whom that promise* (*Genesis* seventeenth, seventh Verse) *doth be-*

Quest. 3. *long, whether his Natural, or his Spiritual Seed?* Our Author adds another Question, viz. *Whether those Children of promise mentioned in the second of Acts the thirty ninth Verse are?* which at present I shall not concern my self about. Let one Question be answered first: And though our Author do not expressly declare his Sentiments at first yet after he doth, and is very peremptory and positive (upon what grounds will presently appear that that promise did not at all, or in any sense belong to *Abraham's* Natural, but wholly and

alone

alone to his spiritual seed. And he conceives the Scriptures themselves give us such a full and plain exposition of this promise, as might seem to be enough to determine the question, without any more ado: What is the good contained in this promise, I shall (if the Lord will) open hereafter, that which we are at present to enquire into is, whether this promise did not belong to *Abraham's* natural seed, and that merely as such; as well as to his spiritual seed? And thus in a direct opposition to what *our Author* hath affirmed, I shall say, That this promise did belong not only to *Abrahams* spiritual but also to his natural seed, and that *eo nomine* as his natural seed: That it did not belong to all his natural seed in the same sence; or after the same manner I freely grant: For take the promise as a definite promise, conveying and making over an actual right and title to the good contained and intended in it to each individual and particular subject of it, so it did belong only to *Abrahams* natural seed immediately proceeding from his own loyns, (as *Ishmael, Isaac &c.*) and it did belong universally to them, or to them one as well as another. But take it as an indefinite promise, signifying to and assuring *Abraham* and his seed of the will and purpose of God to bestow the good, contained and intended in it, upon them in a more special and peculiar manner, so it did belong to his natural seed proceeding mediately from him in all succeeding ages; and consequently in this sence it doth belong to the Jews as the seed of *Abraham* above what it doth to the race or posterity of any men whatsoever to this very day; in

which regard they are *Rom. 11. 16. said to be holy.* We are only at present concern'd in the former way and manner of its belonging to the natural seed of *Abraham*; and that this promise as thus considered, did belong to all *Abrahams* natural seed immediately proceeding from his own loyns hath been (I conceive) so evidently and unanswerably proved elsewhere, that unless

Infant-baptism
pag. 19.

those arguments could be answer'd it may seem wholly superfluous to add any thing more: And indeed the case lies so evident and plain, that it admits of no contradiction, unless men are resolved to force their way over the belly (to use that Scotch phrase) of the plainest Scriptures: Saith God, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed in their generations.* Now how was it possible but that *Abraham* must understand this firstly and immediately of his natural Children. It is true, God had told him that he should be *a father of many Nations*, and he might well think that those nations, he should be a Father to, might be included in the term *seed*; but to understand it of those, excluding his natural Children would have been absurd and irrational: And besides God tells him that to this seed he promiseth to be a God, unto them he would give the land of *Canaan* in which he was now a stranger. Now is it possible that he should imagine that his natural seed were excluded? And yet further that which yet makes it most plain, is the express command of God to apply the token of this very Covenant, and that under that very notion and consideration, as the token of it, to all his natural seed immediately proceeding from his own

own loyns. These things lie so evident, that all attempts against them prove not only vain, but greatly reflect upon their Authors.

Let us then see the Scriptures *our Author* produceth expounding (as he saith) this promise, and (as he conceits) so fully confirming the seed here mention'd, to whom the promise belong'd, not to be *Abraham's* carnal (he should have said natural) but his spiritual seed. And thus he gives us three texts of Scripture; but of how little use as to his purpose will immediately appear. His first Scripture is, *Gal. 3. 16.* where saith the Apostle, *now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made.; he saith, not to seeds as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed which is Christ.* So that the promises were made to Christ, and *our Author* thinks it will infallibly follow, that they were not made to his natural seed. But how he inferrs this he tells us not: That by Christ here we are to understand Christ mystical, that is the Church, including Christ himself as the head: I suppose he hath more understanding than to deny. Now we affirm, that *Abraham's* natural seed, as such, did, as being under the promise, belong to the visible body or Church of Christ, as then gather'd in or constituted of his Family. So that the children of Believers and that as such during their Infant state; belong to the same mystical body of Christ, as upheld and continued yet in the world: Yea we lay this their relation to the Church as one ground of our application of Baptism to them. Now what a vain and frivolous thing is it to imagine, that the Apostles affirming that the promise is only made to Christ

should expound it as excluding Infants from any interest in it, when we do constantly affirm Infants to appertain unto Christ, to whom the promise is made. But I am much perswaded, that *our Author* never intended his book for the satisfaction or conviction of any that either had any considerable stock of reason, or would make use of what they had, but he wrote it for the use of another sort of people. To as little purpose is his citation of the 29 vers. of the same Chapter, *If you be Christs, then are you Abrahams seed*; Εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ. If ye be of Christ or appertain unto Christ as members of his mystical Body, then are ye *Abrahams seed*. And we say (and *our Author* hath not proved the contrary) that the Infant-seed of Believers are of, and do appertain to Christ.

As for his second Scripture, viz. *Rom. 9. 7. 8.* that is so far from expounding the promise in favour of his sence, that it doth necessarily imply the direct contrary, as hath been made to appear elsewhere: The Apostle doth plainly imply, that there were some who were *Abrahams seed*, and as such were the subjects of the promise who were not the Children of God in the sence there intended by the Apostle; such was *Ishmael* as he shews in the following words: But see this text fully opened and vindicated in the forementioned treatise.

For his third Scripture, namely *Rom. 4. 13. 14.* how that should expound the promise in favour of *our Authors* sence is hard to imagine, but to some the bare mention of a Scripture is full proof,

proof, how little soever it make to the purpose. How far and in what sence the Infant-seed of Believers as received into the same Covenant with their Parents; are interested in or made partakers of the righteousness of faith may be enquired into hereafter: let it at present be only observed that both *Isaac* and *Jacob* were joynt-heirs with *Abraham* of the same promise during *Abrahams* life time. Hence it is said, *Heb. 11 9. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange Country, dwelling in Tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob the heirs with him of the same promise.* Now *Jacob* at *Abrahams* death was but fifteen years old, and the Apostle speaks of his living with them for some time before his death in Tabernacles, as being then coheirs with him of the same promise. Now saith the Apostle in this text, both *Abraham* and his seed, among which seed we must necessarily include *Isaac* and *Jacob*, both he and they were heirs through the righteousness of faith. Whence it is plain that *Jacob* (and the same is true of *Isaac*) in his Infant state was an heir of the World, (as the Apostle here speaks) through the righteousness of faith, when he had not a personal faith himself; but as the Child of a Covenant-Parent. Whence it appears, that the Infant-seed of Believers may be heirs of the promises through the righteousness of faith, though themselves not personally believing.

Now then let all men judge, whether these Scriptures do so fully confirm as *our Author* pretends, yea or do give any rational or probable intimation, that not *Abrahams* natural, but only his spiritual seed were intended in that promise:

As for the *dismal consequences* (as he calls them) supposed to arise from what we affirm, they are meer Chimeraes feigned by *our Author* , through his darkness, partly about the true and proper good contained in, and conveyed by the Covenant as extended to the Infant-seed of believers, and partly about the true tenour of the Covenant as made with *Abraham* and his seed in their generations : Of the former I shall (if the Lord will) speak more fully hereafter : Of the latter I

Infant-baptism
from Heaven
from pag 49 to
64.

have spoken sufficiently elsewhere, and shall touch again when I come to speak to his fifth enquiry. Now then these two last enquiries being rightly determined, a good foundation is in a considerable measure laid for the practice of Infant-baptism. For if the Covenant establish'd with *Abraham* be the very same with that Believers are still under ; and *Abrahams* natural seed as immediately proceeding from his own loyns were taken in as joynt subjects with him of the same Covenant and promises, both which things are evidently true : It is very rational to suppose that all his seed (among whom Believers are undoubtedly to be reckon'd) should (as it is certain they do) partake in the same priviledge : And the Infants of Believers being joynt-subjects with their Parents of the Covenant , it is very rational to conclude that they should have the present token applyed to them ; as the Infant-seed of Covenant Parents had the former token of the Covenant applyed unto them, of which more anon. And I cannot (before I proceed any farther) but remark the care of God over, and his goodness

to his Church, that he should so fully acquaint us with, as the nature, so the true tenour of the Covenant, at the first establishment of it with the Father of the faithful; that so if any doubt should after arise, they might have recourse to the first establishment, and from thence receive satisfaction. And no wonder though his will relating to the Infant-seed of his people should be more sparingly spoken to afterwards, when it is so fully and plainly reveiled at the first entrance into Covenant with *Abraham*, and the faithful as his seed.

C H A P. VI.

Mr. Danvers his Four last Grounds respecting the Covenant considered: The unsoundness of his Resolutions of them shewed: The true Resolutions of them given and proved: The Argument drawn from the Covenant how strengthened thereby, shewed.

THE next thing enquired into is, *Whether Circumcision was a seal of the New Covenant to Believers and their seed?*

Ans. The Terms and Phrases our Author hath seen meet to use, his varying of them, together with his uncouth and unscriptural expressions and impertinencies plainly shew for whose sake he wrote. But such things signifie nothing to those

those *who* as *Elihu* speaks, *have ears to try words as well as mouths to tast meat.* That which he is to enquire after, (if his enquiry be any thing to purpose) is, *Whether Circumcision were a seal of the Covenant of Grace as entred with Abraham and his seed in their Generations, to the people of God and their Children or Infant-seed.* This he seems to be very far from yielding, for he first denyes it to be so much as a seal to them, and Secondly, which must needs follow, he much more denyes it to be a seal of the New Covenant, that is the Covenant of Grace, and gives some kind of reasons, such as they are, for those his denyals.

Infant-baptism
from Heaven
pag. 231 to
237.

But having elsewhere proved by several (pardon me though I say) I hope irrefragable Arguments, that Circumcision was a seal to all those who were the due subjects of it (and when I prove it to be a seal, I mean it was so of the Covenant of Grace) I shall not need to say much more, freely appealing to all men of a competent understanding, and not greatly forestalled in their judgments? Whether *our Authors* Reasons do out-weigh those Arguments? I shall therefore briefly consider his Reasons and quickly dismiss the question.

That Circumcision was a seal to *Abraham, our Author* cannot deny, but he conceives it was a seal only to him, and to no body else. The proof of this his conceit he seems to essay two ways, First by Reason, Secondly by humane Authority, his reasons seem to be these two.

First, *The thing that it was a seal, confirmation and ratification of to Abraham was incompatible to Infants;*

Infants; for so he expresseth himself, *its true, it was a seal, confirmation and ratification of the faith that Abraham had long before he was Circumcised, but so could it not be said of any Infant that had no faith.*

Ans. It is a gross mistake to say that Circumcision was a seal, confirmation or ratification of *Abrahams* faith; the scripture saith no such thing, neither do the Authors he cites say any such thing: They say according to Scripture, *it was called a seal of the righteousness of Faith, because it was given to Abraham as a seal and Testimony of that righteousness he had acquired by faith*: They do not say as *our Author*, that it was a seal, confirmation or ratification of the Faith which *Abraham* had before he was circumcised, but of the righteousness of faith. Now that Infants are capable of the righteousness of faith, though they cannot act faith themselves; is evident from that instance of *Jacob* before mentioned, and I suppose *our Author* himself will not upon second thoughts deny it: For I would ask him whether he thinks any Infants are either any way concerned in *Adams* sin, or have any pollution or corruption of nature inherent in themselves? In a word, whether there be any such thing as Original sin, either *Originans* or *Originatum*? if there be, how come any Infants that dye in their Infancy freed from it, do they carry the guilt under which they came into the world into Heaven, or are they universally thrown into Hell? Certainly if any of them be saved, it must be through the righteousness of faith, that is, Gods non-imputation of the guilt to them; and his acceptation of them there-

thereupon as righteous through Christ. Now if they are capable of the righteousness of faith, let him shew any Scripture or Reason, why they might not have that righteousness sealed and confirmed to them by an outward and visible sign. So this first Reason is a mere trifle, signifies nothing at all, let us see his other therefore.

Secondly, He argues from the singularity or speciality of the promises made to *Abraham*, and thus he instances in four promises. First, *that he should be the Father of many Nations*. Secondly, *The father of the Faithful*. Thirdly, *The heir of the world*. Fourthly, *That in him all the Families of the earth should be blessed*: Now he acknowledgeth that Circumcision was a seal or confirmation (witness he calls it, but that's the thing I judge he intends) of these promises to *Abraham*, but because none of his seed had any of these promises appertaining to them, therefore he conceives it could not be a seal unto them.

Ans. Let it be observed, that *our Author* had in his answer to his second question, instanced in (at least) some of these promises, as the promises that were made to *Abraham* as a spiritual Father, and of which he saith, *they in a special manner belong to the Covenant of Grace*; and here he saith that Circumcision was a witness to, or did seal and confirm these promises to *Abraham*; so that according to *our Authors* own acknowledgment, this carnal Ordinance of Circumcision, as our opposers usually call it, might be, yea was a seal of the most spiritual part or promises of the New Covenant to *Abraham*: Yet (such is the power of prejudice) he will not allow it to be a seal, so
much

much as of the most carnal, or temporal promise to any of his seed. But sure he will not meet with many (unless alike prejudiced with himself) but will be easily perswaded, that seeing Circumcision was a seal to *Abraham*, of the most spiritual part of the Covenant, it might (if it pleased God so to ordain it) be not only a seal of the temporal, but also of the spiritual part of the Covenant to any or to all of *Abrahams* seed; whether grown persons or Infants, as well as it was to himself: And the truth is, Circumcision was the token, sign or seal of the whole Covenant, though it did seal and confirm the particular promises contained in it, to particular persons according as they were respectively interested in them. Hence it is called *the token of the Covenant*, without any limitation of its use to any particular promises, *it shall be* (says God speaking of Circumcision) *a token of the Covenant between me and you*, Gen. 17. 11. But I shall leave this to the Judgment of all men, yea of our opposers themselves, whether *our Author* hath said any thing to render it so much as probable, that Circumcision was not a seal to any, unless to *Abraham* himself. But however, be this first thing true or no, yet he seems to be past all doubt, that Circumcision could not be a seal of the New Covenant to Believers, and their seed; therefore says he, *much less was it a seal of the New Covenant*: This he endeavours to prove by this reason, (*viz.*) *because nothing is the seal of the New Testament, but only the spirit*, for which Ephes. 1. 13. and 4. 30. are cited.

Answer. As it is somewhat difficult to guess at what he would say, so unless he purposely designed

ed to beguile his Reader, it can be hardly thought himself knows what he does say : For to what purpose does he talk here of the New Testament, taking that phrase in the New Testament sense. The New Testament sure he knows took not place till the death of the Testator, when Circumcision had a period put to it: And that the spirit was promised or given to the Jews or people of God under the first Testament, to be unto them as the seal of the Covenant as then administered, is an assertion that must owe its original to Mr. *Danvers*. But to bring the Reader out of this maze of nonsensical words, I shall affirm in a direct opposition to what he affirms, that Circumcision was not only a seal to the people of God and their seed under the first Testament, but was a seal unto them of the Covenant of Grace : It was a seal unto them of that Covenant established with *Abraham* and his seed in their generations; But that was the Covenant of Grace; Therefore Circumcision was a seal unto them of the Covenant of Grace : That that Covenant was the Covenant of Grace, the same under which Believers still are; and that Circumcision was a seal of that Covenant to all those whether grown persons or Infants, who as under the Covenant had it duly applied to them; and that Infants were under that Covenant hath been proved already : Hence the Conclusion is undeniable. I shall only add one Argument more to prove what is affirmed, (*viz*) That Circumcision was a seal of the Covenant of Grace to all, whether Infants or grown persons, that were the due and proper subjects of it, and so dismiss this question.

Arg. When

Arg. When any Ordinance is appointed for, or applied to several subjects under one and the same notion, look of what use that Ordinance is interpreted by the Holy Ghost himself, to be unto any of them; of the same use it is, and ought to be so interpreted unto all, supposing them capable of such an use, and God hath nowhere declared his will that it should not be of such an use to them for whom it is appointed, and to whom it is duly applied. But Circumcision was appointed for and applied to *Abraham* and all his seed, whether Believers or their seed under one and the same notion; and is interpreted by the Holy Ghost himself to be of this use (*viz.*) a seal of the Covenant of Grace unto *Abraham*: Therefore it is and ought to be interpreted of that use to all his seed, whether Believers or their seed, who are the due and proper subjects of it. For the major proposition, the truth of that is past all rational doubt, the denial of it will give a shrewd stroke to the faith and comfort of all believers.

For the minor proposition, that consists of two branches, First, that Circumcision was appointed for and applied to *Abraham* and all his seed under one and the same notion (*viz.*) as the token of the Covenant, this is the express words of the text, *Gen. 17. 11.*

Secondly, That it is interpreted by the Holy Ghost himself to be unto him a seal of the Covenant of Grace: It is interpreted to be a seal of the promise of the Covenant of Grace, and consequently of the Covenant constituted and made up of those promises; that it was a seal of the promises of, or belonging to the Covenant of Grace,

our Author himself acknowledgeth, and is undeniable from that *Rom. 4. 11.* and hence our conclusion will undenyably follow. We see then first, that the Covenant established with *Abraham* and his seed in their generations was the Covenant of Grace, the very same with that Believers are still under. Secondly, that the promises of the Covenant, and consequently the Covenant it self, did belong to *Abrahams* natural seed immediately proceeding from his own loyns, as well as to his spiritual : And Thirdly, that Circumcision was the seal of the Covenant of Grace ; that Covenant of which it was the seal being the Covenant of Grace : As for what *our Author* adds in the close of this question concerning Baptism, as it concerns not the present question, so it is of no consideration in it self, though I may touch upon it in its proper place, yet let me say, as it does greatly reflect upon any to write, so it seems somewhat to reflect upon the understanding of all men, to answer such trifles as these : It arguing a very low ebb of humane reason that any man should need help to see the vanity of them : But to proceed,

5. The fifth thing *our Author* proposes for his examination is, *Whether Circumcision was administered to Believers as Believers, and to their seed after them as such, to which Baptism was to correspond.* This *our Author* vehemently denies, with what reason will soon appear ; only as previous to the consideration of his determination of this question, and giving the true solution of it, I must a little open the true sence and meaning of it : And thus, when it is queried, whether Circumcision

cumcision was administred to believers as believers? the meaning must needs be (otherwise we are not at all concern'd in it,) whether Circumcision was *de jure*, according to the institution administred, or to be administred to believers, as believers? that it might be *de facto* administred to others than *de jure* it ought to be is unquestionable: How or to whom it was at any time administred, concerns not us; but how or to whom it was administred, when administred according to the mind of God in the institution. So then the question is, whether Circumcision according to the will and appointment of God, was or ought to be administred to Believers as Believers? Why *our Author* useth New Testament terms and phrases, when speaking with respect to the Old Testament times he knows best. But by believers we are to understand such as according to that administration were to be accounted and reputed the Covenant people of God, such who according to the terms then proposed, might warrantably lay claim to that promise of Gods being a God to them; what was a sure ground for such a claim we determine not, it concerns not our present purpose: Our only enquiry at present is, whether Circumcision was according to the will of God administred to the Covenant people of God, or to persons as personally accepting of, and performing the terms or conditions of the Covenant as then administred, and that as such, and to their seed as such? Or whether it was not administred to men upon some other account, as suppose their relation to *Abraham* as his natural posterity or the like, and consequently whether there be

in this particular, a correspondency between the administration of Circumcision and the administration of Baptism, so that this one question may be branched out into three distinct questions.

I shall begin with the First: And that is, whether Circumcision was according to the will of God administered to believers as believers, that is, to persons as personally accepting of, and performing the conditions of the Covenant of Grace, as administered under the first Testament and that as such?

Our Author is still on the negative part, he is very positive it was not, and he gives this reason of his perswasion: For, *says he, it was an Ordinance which by the institution belonged to all the natural lineage and posterity of Abraham, good or bad, without any such limitation as is put upon Baptism, if thou believest with all thy heart thou mayst*: But sure he could not but suspect, there would be some sincere enquirers after the mind of God relating to Infant-baptism, who cannot pin their faith upon his sleeve, cannot rest satisfied with his bare word; therefore he should have proved this his assertion, which he attempts not to do, either by Scripture, Reason or Authority: And therefore without any more ado I must enter my dissent, and do on the contrary affirm, that Circumcision whenever administered to the Adult, in case it was administered according to the institution, it was to believers as believers, taking that term believers as before opened. Now the clearing up and proving this so highly conducing unto the establishing the Doctrine and practice of Infant-baptism, I shall somewhat largely insist upon it, and

and for the proof of it I would offer these two Arguments.

First, If all the Adult or grown persons that ever had Circumcision duly administred unto them were believers, and there was no other ground upon which it could be administred to them, then it was administred to them as believers: But all the Adult or grown persons universally, that had Circumcision duly administred to them were believers, and there was no other ground upon which it could be rightfully administred to them, Therefore, &c.

The consequence in the major proposition, I conceive will meet with no opposition: I suppose if it be evident, that all grown persons universally, none excepted, that had Circumcision administred according to the institution were believers, and there was no other ground but only their faith, or personal acceptation and performance of the terms of the Covenant, upon which it could be rightfully applyed to them, then this consequence will evidently follow, they must needs have it administred to them as believers. 'Tis therefore only the minor proposition that needs proof; and in order to a more clear proceeding in the proof of it, we must necessarily distinguish of the Adult or grown persons who had Circumcision administred to them; and thus some of them were *sui juris*, had a full liberty and freedom of choice whether to accept or not accept of the Covenant upon such terms; others were *alterius juris*, under the dominion and dispose of some other person: Thus for all the Adult in *Abrahams* or any other believers family,

who were servants either born in the house, or bought with money : Now what was the case of this latter sort of grown persons, and how far the determination of the question before us as it relates unto them concerns our present purpose shall be considered hereafter. At present, let it be remembred, that what I affirm, it is only of persons who were *sui juris*, who were at their own dispose, and I say in respect of such all and that universally that ever had Circumcision rightfully administred to them, they were Believers in the sence before opened : This will appear by instancing in all those that the Scripture records to have had Circumcision administred to them, when adult or grown to ripeness of years ; and shewing that they were believers. And thus the Scripture gives us no account of any circumcised when adult, but *Abraham* and those of his posterity whose Circumcision was omitted in the wilderness, and such who from among the Gentiles became proselytes to the Jewish Church, and all those the Scripture evidently declares to have been believers.

First, For *Abraham* himself, none will deny that he was a believer : And therefore

Secondly, For those of his posterity whose Circumcision was omitted in the wilderness, and who were circumcised at their first entrance into the land of *Canaan*, an account of which we have *Josh. 5. 3. &c.* Now that these were believers, is sufficiently evident, for

First, God himself gives this testimony of them, that they were such as had cleaved to him when others had apostatized from him, *Dent. 4.*

Secondly, They were such as had newly renewed their Covenant with God, they had avouched God to be their God, and he had avouched them to be his people, twenty sixth of *Deut.* 17, 18. Verses, compared with the twenty ninth of *Deuteronomy*, the beginning: These two things sufficiently evidence these to be Believers, and they had done nothing to evidence their insincerity, but had several wayes evidenced it, and therefore

Thirdly, for such who from among the *Gentiles* did become Profelytes to the *Jewish* Church: Now I do not remember that the Scriptures do record any particular instance of any of these to have been circumcised; but that such were to be, and that some such were circumcised is sufficiently clear from Scripture, and that when any such had circumcision rightfully administered to them, that they were believers is evident.

First, from the qualification presupposed to their regular receiving circumcision, they must be such as *would keep the Passover to the Lord*, twelfth of *Exodus* forty eighth Verse. Mark, it was not enough that they did desire to keep the Passover, but they must be such as did professedly propose that end to themselves, *viz. to keep it to the Lord*, and Passover here seems to be put *per Synecdochen partis*, for the whole Worship of God; and so the meaning is this; if any would give up themselves to God, and take him for their God, and worship and serve him according to the Ordinances of Worship then instituted; they must be circumcised: So that the qualifica-

tions requisite to their circumcision do necessarily imply them to be believers.

Secondly, this is evident from God's alike entering into Covenant with them, as he did with the Jewes, *Deut.* 29. 11, 15. Now God's entering into Covenant with them doth necessarily imply them to be Believers, in as much as the Covenant, when entred with grown persons, is inutual, as God avoucheth such to be his people; so they must avouch him to be their God, otherwise the Covenant could not be entred with them.

Thirdly, this is yet further evident by the descriptions the Holy Ghost gives of such Profelytes; thus they are sometimes described by *their putting their trust under the wings of the God of Israel*, *Ruth* 2. 12. Sometimes by *their taking hold of the Covenant, and joyning themselves to the Lord*, *Isaiah* 56; which, though it be a Prophecie of the conversion of the *Gentiles* in New Testament Times, yet plainly alludes to the Profelytes under the first Testament, and shews us what they did or ought to do in order to their incorporation into the Church of the *Jews*; and as a further confirmation of this, *Jewish* Authors give us a large account what care was taken in the admission of Profelytes to circumcision, lest they should have some by respect in their desiring of it; thus they diligently enquired whether they were not fallen in love with some *Jewish* woman, and the like: So that from what hath been said, it fully appears that all those universally, that had circumcision rightfully administred to them, they were believers:

If any shall say, there might be some other ground upon which circumcision was administered to them, let that ground be shewed; If the Scriptures declare no other ground, then we may conclude there was none; But the Scriptures declare no other ground, Therefore we may conclude there was none; and that there was indeed no other ground upon which circumcision was administered to them will more fully appear by our second Argument, which is

Secondly, if none of *Abraham's* Lineage or Posterity, beyond those that did immediately proceed from his own Loyns could have circumcision duly administered to them upon that ground or account of their relation to him as his natural seed, then none could have it rightfully administered to them upon any other ground than their own personal faith, or acceptance and performance of the terms of the Covenant; and consequently all that had circumcision rightfully administered to them it was as believers: But the former is true; Therefore the latter.

For the consequence in the major Proposition, that is grounded upon this supposition (*viz.*) That mens relation to *Abraham* as his Children, though mediately descended from him, is the chief and principal ground that can be imagined to be a sufficient ground upon which circumcision could be rightfully administered to any; now if it could not be rightfully administered upon that ground, much less upon any other: But I judge (and therefore shall surcease any further proof of it) this will receive a ready acknowledgment from our opposers themselves, hence

hence *our Author* only instanceth in this as the ground upon which circumcision could be administered to persons whether good or bad.

It is the Minor that requires proof, *our Author* asserts the direct contrary, but how unreasonable we shall now see; That then which we are to prove is this, *viz.* that none of *Abraham's* Posterity or Lineage beyond those, immediately descending from his own Loyns, could have circumcision administered to them according to Divine Institution upon that ground, *viz.* their relation to him as his Children, and consequently none else could have it rightfully administered to them upon any other ground whatsoever; but whoever had it rightfully administered to them, it was as they were believers; this I shall prove by this Argument; If circumcision could be administered to none of *Abraham's* Lineage or Posterity, whether Infants or grown persons; but upon the account of their precedent interest in and right to the Covenant and the promises thereof, of which it was the token; and none of *Abraham's* adult seed mediately proceeding from him had a right to or interest in that Covenant, but such as did personally accept of and perform the conditions thereof, then none of his adult Lineage or Posterity mediately descended from him could have Circumcision rightfully administered to them upon the ground or account of that their relation to him as his natural Children mediately descended from him; But the former is true; Therefore the latter: Here again the Consequence in the Major Proposition will have no gainsay, but the Minor needs proof. Now
that

that consists of two Propositions.

First, that none ought according to the Institution to have Circumcision administered to them, but such as had a precedent interest in, and right to the Covenant and the promises of it; this is too evident to admit of any rational contradiction; for

First, it is evident from the notion under which circumcision was commanded; it was commanded under that notion, *viz.* as the token of the Covenant: Now how unreasonable would it be to imagine that God should appoint circumcision to be applied to any under that notion as the token of his Covenant, who had no right to or interest in the Covenant; how could it be the token of the Covenant to any uninterested in the Covenant; but of this more elsewhere.

Infant-Baptism;
Page 22. to 28.

Secondly, this is evident, because the application and reception of Circumcision was a keeping the Covenant; now how the Covenant can be said to be kept by the application and reception of Circumcision, unless the subjects to whom it was applied were in Covenant is impossible to be imagined; can a person keep the Covenant that is not in Covenant? What is keeping the Covenant, but a performing the conditions of the Covenant on man's part? And can any man perform the conditions of the Covenant, and yet have no right to, or interest in the Covenant, or the promises of it?

Thirdly, this is further evident, because interest in the Covenant is the ground of the command concerning the application and reception of circumcision.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, this is yet further evident, because otherwise God could not truly say of Circumcision, when duly applied, it is the token of the Covenant between him, and the party to whom it is applied; of both these things I have spoken largely in the place forecited.

Fifthly, it is evident from hence, *viz.* because otherwise it had been the universal duty of all *Abraham's* natural seed, whether those descended from *Ishmael* and *Esau*, or from *Isaac*, to have continued the practice of circumcision, notwithstanding their utter apostasie from and rejection of God, and his utter rejection of them from being his people: But who can imagine that circumcision was or could have been duly applied to the *Edomites* or *Ishmalites* when acting in wayes of greatest opposition to, and rebellion against God? and what absurdities would follow upon such an assertion might easily be declared: It is also inconsistent with what *our Author* himself hath elsewhere affirmed of circumcision: But why should I enlarge upon the confirmation of that, the truth of which shines forth with a noon-light clearness. And from what hath been said, it undeniably follows, that none were circumcised by vertue of any command from God, but such as were received into Covenant; contrary to what *our Author* affirms in his resolution of the first question; but let that suffice for the confirmation of the first Proposition.

2. *Propos.* The second Proposition, is that none of *Abraham's* adult seed, none of his natural seed grown up to years of maturity, had an interest

interest in or right to the Covenant or promises thereof, but such as did personally accept of and perform the terms or conditions of the Covenant, or according to *our Author's* Phrase, were believers.

This I have proved by three Arguments elsewhere, let me add these two or three more.

Infant-Baptism,
Page 67. to 80.

Arg. 1. First, if any of *Abraham's* Lineage or Posterity, beyond those that did immediately proceed from his own Loyns, had a right to or interest in the Covenant meerly as of his Lineage and Posterity, then all his Lineage and Posterity had a like right to and interest in the Covenant; But all his Lineage and Posterity had not an interest in, or right to the Covenant; Therefore none had meerly as of his Lineage and Posterity: The truth of the consequence in the major proposition stands firm upon that universally received Maxim, *A quatenus ad omne valet consequentia*; look what may be predicated of, or may be laid claim to by any one man, *quatenus homo*, meerly as a man, that may be predicated of, and laid claim to by all men universally; so in this case, but now it is infallibly certain that all the Lineage and Posterity of *Abraham* had not an interest in the Covenant, therefore none of them had meerly as his Lineage and Posterity.

Arg. 2. Secondly, if *Abraham's* natural Lineage and Posterity, beyond those immediately proceeding from his own Loyns, had had an interest in and right to the Covenant meerly as his Lineage and Posterity, then Covenant breaking on their part had been impossible; But Covenant breaking

breaking on their part was not impossible, Therefore, &c.

The consequence in the major proposition is evident by this, *viz.* Because then their relation to *Abraham* as his Lineage and Posterity had been the only and alone condition of the Covenant on their parts, nothing more had been simply and absolutely necessary to their interest in and right to the Covenant; but only that their relation to *Abraham*: As in the case of his Children immediately proceeding from his own Loyns, they had an interest in the Covenant meerly as his natural seed, and hence nothing more was necessary to that their interest, but only their descent from and relation to him as his Seed or Children: So in case the Covenant had extended to all his natural Lineage and Posterity, as it did to those immediately proceeding from his own Loyns, their case had been one and the same: Now there can be no breach of the Covenant on man's part, but through his failing and coming short in the conditions of the Covenant: Hence suppose the *Jews* meer relation to *Abraham* as his Lineage and Posterity had been the alone condition of their interest in the Covenant, it would have been impossible for them to break the Covenant; in as much as their sin, whether of omission or commission could not dissolve that their relation to *Abraham*: No moral evil can dissolve a natural relation; hence while their relation to *Abraham* as his Lineage and Posterity had continued, their Covenant interest would have continued. But now (which is our minor Proposition) that Covenant breaking

ing was not impossible unto them, the rejection of *Ishmael* and his Posterity, of *Esau* and his Posterity, of the ten Tribes first, and after of the *Jews*, is abundant evidence: How such as are received into the Covenant of Grace in their infancy, may be said to break Covenant; and how that their breach of Covenant is consistent with the unchangeableness of the Covenant of Grace, and with the Doctrine of the Saints perseverance I have shewed elsewhere.

Arg. 3. If *Abraham's* natural Lineage and Posterity, beyond those proceeding from his own Loyns, had not an interest in, and right to the Covenant, meerly as such, then none of them could have been justly and righteously, finally cut off, excluded from, or cast out of, either the Covenant or Commonwealth of *Israel*, either by the immediate hand of God, or by any Ecclesiastical censure; But some of the Lineage or Posterity of *Abraham* might be justly and righteously cut off, excluded from, and cast out of, both the Covenant and Commonwealth of *Israel*, and that either by the immediate hand of God, or by an Ecclesiastical censure; Therefore, &c.

The consequence in the major Proposition is firm upon this ground, *viz.* that nothing could be a just cause for such a cutting off, or excluding from, and casting out of either the Covenant or Commonwealth of *Israel*, but what did nullifie their interest in the Covenant: To deprive a man of what he hath a just interest in, and title to is unjust; now if the interest of the *Jews* in the Covenant, did meerly depend upon their relation to *Abraham*, as his Lineage or Posterity, it is impossible

impossible their interest could cease while that their relation did continue, and consequently for them, or any of them to have been finally cut off from, or cast out of either the Covenant or commonwealth of *Israel*, either by the immediate hand of God, or by any Ecclesiastical censure, had been unjust or unrighteous: But now that some of them or any of them, in some cases might be justly and righteously finally cut off, excluded from, and cast out of either the Covenant, or Commonwealth of *Israel*, and that either by the immediate hand of God, or by some Ecclesiastical censure, is evident both from Scriptures and Jewish Authors. To what end were threatnings given out, unless their execution had been just and righteous? now how often does God threaten that whosoever should be guilty of such or such sins, *they should be cut off from their people?* and some of these cuttings off did extend to a final exclusion from the Covenant, and all the benefits of it: So that not to enlarge (though other arguments might be added) from what hath been said, it evidently appears that none of *Abrahams* lineage or posterity beyond those immediately proceeding from his own loyns, had an interest in the Covenant merely as such, and if none, then not the Adult, and consequently unto their interest there was indispensibly required their own personal faith: Thus we see both branches of our second argument fully proved: And hence the conclusion undenyably follows (*viz.*) that none of *Abrahams* adult seed, beyond those that did immediately proceed from his own loyns, that were *sui juris*, (for of such we are yet speaking) had

Circumcision

Circumcision duly administred to them by vertue of their relation to him as his natural seed; and consequently whoever of them had Circumcision rightfully administred to them, it was as they were believers. But

Secondly, I shall a little touch upon the question, as it may concern such who were *alterius juris*, who were at the dispose, as being under the dominion, of others; of this sort were all those who were born in the houses of, or bought with money by Abraham, or any of the Covenant people of God in after ages, who had Circumcision administred to them when adult: The command was, *that he that was bought with money or born in the house should be circumcised*, as well as their natural children, and some of these might be, (as it is evident some of them in *Abrahams* family were) adult or grown persons: Now the question is, whether it was necessary in order to these, having Circumcision administred to them, that they should be believers, or whether such might not, yea ought not to have Circumcision administred, as merely appertayning to the family of the people of God whether they were good or bad?

Now for this I shall but briefly touch upon it, because it concerns not the practice in controverfie between us, I shall therefore only offer to consideration these few things, and come to the second question.

First, That such as we now speak of had the promises of the Covenant, and consequently the Covenant it self extended to them, as well as they had or were to have Circumcision administred to them, this is evident both *a priori*, and *a posteriori*.

First, *A priori*, and thus it was promised to *Abraham*, that all the families of the earth should be blessed in him, *Gen. 12. 3.* that is in him and in his seed, for so the promise is exprest when renewed to *Jacob*, *Gen. 28. 14.* and by seed, though we are to understand Christ as chiefly and principally, yet is the mystical seed of *Abraham*, as subordinately and lets principally, intended: So that both *Abraham* and his mystical seed are according to this promise made and constituted a blessing to their respective families, or their respective families are blessed in them; and let it be observed, it is not only their natural children but their families that are interested in this blessing: Now this blessing was, interest in the Covenant, and hence it is that God promises, to be the God of all the families of *Israel*, *Jer. 31. 1.* and hence salvation is said to come to the houses of Believers; salvation is this day come to this house, says Christ of *Zacheus* his house: So the promise of salvation is made to the house of believers, Believe in the Lord *Jesus* and thou shalt be saved and thy house, says *Paul* to the *Jaylor*, *Acts. 16.* All which Scriptures do shew, that *Abrahams* seed are blessings to their respective houses, and that they are so as they do convey an interest in the Covenant and promises thereof unto them.

Secondly, This is evident *a posteriori*, from the reference that Circumcision had to the Covenant, it was to be applyed to none but to such as were in Covenant, as has been before proved: So that I say, those to whom Circumcision was or was to be administred, they had a precedent right to and interest in the Covenant, they were under

under a promise of *Gods being a God to them.*

Secondly, I would offer this to consideration, that as *Abraham*, so all other Masters or Governours of families, they had a right to dispose of, and answerably they ought to dedicate those, we now speak of, up to God, and thereupon teach them his ways and command them as to take God for their God, so to walk in his ways. And hence it is to be observed, that none were to be circumcised but such as they had a right and power to dispose of in a subordination unto God, they were to be such as were properly *their own*, and hence it must needs be their duty to dedicate and give them up to God, and instruct them in his ways; and this God does, as I may so speak, promise to himself concerning *Abraham*, *Gen. 18. 9.* *For I know Abraham that he will command his children and his household, and they shall keep the way of the Lord:* He will not only command his children but his household.

Thirdly, That as when the people of God are faithful in the discharge of their duty, God does usually concur with them therein with his blessing; so this command concerning the Circumcision of the persons we now speak of, seems to be grounded upon a supposal of both, (*viz.*) that the people of God were and would be faithful in the discharge of their duty towards those born in their house or bought with their money, and that they had a blessing attending them therein. And hence we may

Fourthly, conclude, that all those born in the house or bought with money, who were adult, did make such a visible profession of their owning

God as their God, and accepting of the Covenant as entred with them, as did give a rational ground to hope they were sincere therein. It cannot rationally be supposed that such should be received into the Church by Circumcision of whom they had just ground to conclude they should be immediately cast out again, as in case of their manifesting their non acceptance of the terms of the Covenant by any overt act, they ought to be. Surely if *Ishmael* one of *Abrahams* natural seed, was cast out upon the first discovery of his rejection of the Covenant, it cannot be rationally imagined, that any grown persons should be received into it, but upon a visible manifestation of their acceptance of it : So that the true resolution of this question, as it respects the persons we now speak of, is this, that though the Covenant extended to them, and they had a visible title to it as of, or belonging to such a Family, yet in order to the regular administration of Circumcision to them, it was necessary that they did visibly manifest their personal acceptance of it, and resolution to keep it : But this not concerning our main question, I shall add no more to it, but proceed to the second question, and that is,

Quest. 2. Whether Circumcision was administered to the seed of Believers as such? That is merely as the seed of such believing parents: Our Author still holds the negative, that they had not; we the affirmative that they had.

All the reason he gives for his perswasion is this, *that no such qualification was required to an Infants Circumcision, that he should have a believ-*
ing

ing parent : The vanity and ungroundedness of which sufficiently appears from what hath been already said, for if so be the due administration of Circumcision to the Adult aforeuncircumcised, did necessarily presuppose their faith as we have already seen it did, then past all rational doubt, unto the due administration of Circumcision to their Infants, it was necessary that they themselves should be believers : If faith was required to their own Circumcision, it must needs be alike required to their seeds Circumcision who derived their right thereunto from them : This might be further enlarged upon, but supposing the truth of what hath been already discoursed, the truth of what we here affirm will evidently appear to all rational and intelligent persons; for if so be, none could have Circumcision administered to them, but such as had an interest in and right to the Covenant, of which it was the sign or token: Then it undenyably follows, that Infants in order to the due administration of Circumcision to them, must needs have an interest in, and title to the Covenant : And how could Infants come to that interest? it could not be by any personal act of their own, it was not as related to *Abraham*, as of his lineage and posterity; for we have seen already, that none of his lineage or posterity had actual and personal interest in the Covenant, beyond such as did immediately proceed from his own loyns, by vertue of their relation to him : Hence, their interest must needs arise from Gods extending his Covenant as entered with their parents unto them; and the truth is that the promise to the seed, giving them

their interest in, and title to the Covenant is a branch of the Covenant as made with the parents: Now unto the parents entering & reception into the Covenant, their personal faith was required: From all, it will undenyably follow, that all Infants that had Circumcision duly administered to them, it was as they were the seed of believing parents.

And from all it will yet further follow, as I have elsewhere noted and desire may be carefully observed, that all *Abrahams* natural seed and posterity beyond those proceeding from his own loyns, and that in their Infant state; had the Covenant with the sign and token of it continued to them, and held their interest therein, till rejected of God (First at the transportation of the ten tribes by *Salmanazar*, and after at the coming in of the gospel-administration) not merely as his natural but as his spiritual or mystical seed: Children as grown up to years of maturity were to accept and take hold of the Covenant into which they had admission in their infancy, as the seed of believing parents by personal faith and obedience: Whereupon the consideration of their natural relation, either to *Abraham*, or their believing parents was laid aside, and they ceased to stand under the Covenant, by virtue of that their natural descent, either from *Abraham* or any of his seed, and now were continued under it, as being believers themselves, and as such did convey a right to the Covenant and token of it to their natural seed: So that the Church of the Jews was a spiritual and mystical not a carnal Church, as *our Author* without any true ground from scripture or reason calls it, it was constituted

ted and made up of *Abrahams* mystical seed, including their natural children immediately proceeding from their own loyns, and that only during their infant state: For being grown to years of maturity they ought, supposing their rejection of the Covenant, to have been by Church discipline ejected and cast out of the Church. I know what it is that makes what we now affirm so difficultly received by our opposers (*viz.*) the variety of evils, as Idolatry and the like so frequently charged upon that Church and people; but to the mind of wisdom, as *our Author* speaks, seriously weighing the ~~same~~ ^{low} measure of the spirit then given forth, together with the terms of Covenant interest then proposed, and adding to both the consideration of several of the New Testament Churches, immediately after their plantation by the Apostles, the difficulty will soon be removed: But not to enlarge upon this, let that suffice for the second question proposed for examination, unto this fifth particular.

Quest. 3. Thirdly, whether Baptism do correspond to Circumcision as thus administred to Believers as Believers, and to their seed after them and that as such.

Ans. To which it is readily answered, that it does, and supposing the truth of what hath been said, will be easily granted by our opposers themselves: That Baptism is to be administred to believers as believers, when the adult, as being unbaptized before, become the subjects of it, is granted on all hands; and that it is to be administred to their seed after them, and that as such, is affirmed, and we hope sufficiently proved by us.

And supposing what hath been said in the resolution of the foregoing question be true, will not (I cannot but think) be gainsayd by any. Whence to add any thing more to this would be but a needless expence of time, only I shall add one Argument to prove, both the Covenant-interest and Baptism of the Infants of believers, and so proceed to the sixth question, and it is this.

Arg. If the Gospel Church be so incorporated into, and a continuation of the mystical or spiritual body of Christ and household of God, of which the Jews under the Old Testament were, as to make up with them but one body or household; and the natural seed of the Jews by vertue of their Covenant-interest were of, and by the then token of the Covenant were incorporated into that body or household; then the natural seed of believers by vertue of the same Covenant interest are of, and by the present token of the Covenant ought still to be incorporated into the same body of Christ or household of God, But the former is true, Therefore the latter. But to proceed

6. That which is further enquired into is, whether Baptism do succeed in the room, place, uses, and ends of Circumcision?

Here *our Author* denyes two things, and gives us several reasons, such as they are, of both his denyals. First, he vehemently denyes *that Baptism does succeed in the room and place of Circumcision.*

What he means by room and place, is somewhat questionable, that which only concerns us to enquire after is, Whether Baptism be the present sign or token of the Covenant, as Circumcision was of old? Now that it is, and answerably

bly does succeed in the room and place of Circumcision, in that general notion and consideration of it, I have elsewhere abundantly proved, and shewed the vanity and insignificancy of what is objected concerning the spirits being the seal of the New Covenant, and therefore need add no more: I shall therefore only briefly weigh *our Authors* reasons and hasten.

Infant-baptism
from page 223
to 241.

First, His first reason is, because in case Baptism did succeed in the room and place of Circumcision, *then only males and not females would be baptized, because of old only males were circumcised.* To which I would reply, by asking *our Author* who told him so, how came he to know it would be thus or thus in case Baptism did succeed in the room and place of Circumcision? Might not God if it pleased him ordain a token of his Covenant, under the first Testament, that Males only were capable of, and upon the account of the incapability of Females not impose it upon them, and then lay that aside and ordain another token of the Covenant, to succeed in the room and place of the former, in that general notion of it, (*viz.*) as the token of it, of which Females were as capable as males, and thereupon require the application of it to them, as well as to Males? I say, why may it not be thus, if God so pleased? As we suppose it is sufficiently evident it hath so pleased him; who shall dictate unto God or *enjoyn him* as Elihu speaks, *the way he shall proceed in towards his Church?* Men may as well say were God so good and just as he styles himself to be in his word, he would have made man otherwise

wife

wife, than he hath done; as say, in case this or that be true, then he would have ordered his Dispensations otherwise than he hath done; but what acceptation such bold questions, *why hast thou made me thus?* Will find with God, the Scripture foreshews us; but

Secondly; in case Baptism do succeed in the room and place of Circumcision, then *our Author* thinks not all but only some adult believers should have been baptized, and the ground of this his conceit is because, as he takes it for granted, *not all but only some believers were circumcised.*

Ans. This reason is much of the same nature with the former, only here is one mistake suggested, which was not in the former, and that is, that some, consequent to the Institution of Circumcision, who were to be accounted *Abraham's* seed, were not (he must mean as not being under any command from God) circumcised; this *our Author* dictates but attempts not at all to prove; and therefore I shall let it pass as a fond conceit, without the least shew of ground in Scripture, and only say, suppose this were true; yet how it should prove that Baptism does not succeed in the room and place of Circumcision, as the sign and token of the Covenant appears not, and therefore what was said to the former reason, may be said to this: But I say this reason being grounded upon a gross mistake it vanisheth, and comes to nothing; could *our Author* instance in any one person that was to be accounted one of *Abraham's* seed, and shew how, or where he had been exempted from the obligation of that Command, enjoying *A-*
braham

braham and his Seed in their Generations to keep the Covenant, he would say somewhat, though not much to his purpose.

Thirdly, his third reason is; because *then the circumcised needed not to have been baptized*: Surely the Reader will judge me a man of no great employment, to throw away time upon such trifles; Is *our Author* alone ignorant, that upon the Institution of Baptism, Circumcision ceased to be the Token of the Covenant? or does he think it meet that any, that through their faith in Christ are contained in the Covenant, should be exempted from bearing, or had no need of the token of the Covenant? But of this elsewhere: We see now of what consideration *our Authors* reasons are, whereby he endeavours to confirm his first denial; and therefore

Secondly, let us see how he hath proved his second denial, *viz. That Baptism does not succeed Circumcision in regard of the use and ends of it*: How far it is necessary that there should be a correspondency between Baptism and Circumcision, in order to the proving the practice of Infant-Baptism, hath been already declared; and from what hath been said, it will appear, that should all *our Authors* grounds, as he calls them, upon which he bottoms his denial be good, yet Baptism may succeed Circumcision as the sign and token of the Covenant, and as such serve to some uses and ends of Circumcision; But let us see his Grounds;

First, sayes he, *Circumcision was a sign of Christ to come in the flesh, but Baptism a sign that he was already*

already come, witnessing to his Incarnation, Burial, and Resurrection.

Ans. I shall here again ask *our Author* this one question; whether he thinks it was possible, for God to institute any sign or token of his Covenant, when once Circumcision was laid aside? I suppose he will hardly deny this possible to infinite wisdom and power, if he say, it was simply and absolutely possible in it self, I would know, whether this Ordinance, whatever it should be, must needs be a sign of Christ to come in the flesh? if it must, then Christ must be alwayes to come in the flesh; such kind of doughty grounds Anabaptists build their perswasion upon, but it may be his other grounds are more substantial; Therefore,

Secondly, sayes he, *Circumcision was to be a partition wall between Jews and Gentiles, but Baptism testified the contrary, viz. that all are now one in Christ.*

Ans. I must again ask *our Author* whether he think there is no difference between a wall and a door in the wall, and whether both must be of one and the same use? I alwayes judged that a wall was to keep out, a door to let in, and Circumcision was as *our Author* himself acknowledgeth, a solemn Ordinance for the admission of persons, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, into the Church; he expressly calls it a door, *Page 27.* and so is Baptism; the truth is, Circumcision was not the wall, nor any part of it, so that here they agree, being both of one and the same use; but

Thirdly, sayes he, *Circumcision initiated the carnal Seed into the carnal Church, and gave a*
right

right unto carnal Ordinances ; but it is quite otherwise with Baptism.

Ans. I must yet once more desire *our Author* to resolve me one question further , and here I would be serious with him , and that is, whether he thinks Christ had any visible Church or Mystical Body, of which himself was Head, under the first Testament ? if not , how is the Church of the *Jews* called his Spouse, his Wife ? If yea , who were the persons this Church or Body of Christ was constituted and made up of ? But I hope I have sufficiently proved , that the *Jewish* Church was a mystical spiritual Church, or the mystical spiritual Body of Christ, and so Circumcision and Baptism serve for the same use and ends , viz. to initiate or give a solemn entrance and admission into the mystical Body, Church, or Kingdom of Christ, as visible here upon Earth.

Fourthly, *Our Author* adds another Ground, viz. *Circumcision* , sayes he , *was to be a bond and obligation to keep the whole Law of Moses , but Baptism witnessed that Moses his Law was made void, and that Christ's Law was only to be kept.*

But of what use was it before the Law was given ? And if it was of some use before the Law was in being ; why may not Baptism be , if not of the same use (which yet certainly it is) yet of such use , both to the adult and Infants , as might be a sufficient ground for its Institution and Application to both , though the Law be now abrogated : But to say that Circumcision was an obligation to keep the whole Law of *Moses* , any further than the Covenant of Grace established

120 Infant Baptism from Heaven,
blished with *Abraham* and his Seed in their Generations did oblige them thereunto, is a great mistake, Circumcision obliged to keep the Law of Christ, and so does Baptism.

Fifthly, the fifth ground *our Author* layes to what he hath asserted, *viz.* that Baptism does not succeed Circumcision to the use and ends of it, as he speaks, is this, *Circumcision* says he, was administered to all *Abraham's natural Seed*, without any profession of Faith, Repentance, or Regeneration, whereas Baptism, to be administered to the spiritual seed of *Abraham*, was only upon profession of Faith, Repentance and Regeneration.

Ans. But what does this concern the uses and ends, either of Circumcision or Baptism? This only concerns the Subjects, the one was, and the other is to be administered to.

Reply. But it may be it will be said, though it do not directly concern the matter in hand, yet consequentially it does, for if so be, the Subjects of Circumcision and Baptism are so vastly different, the use and ends cannot be one and the same.

Ans. But then we absolutely deny the grounds from whence this consequence is drawn; we deny that Circumcision was administered to all *Abraham's natural Seed*; yea, that it was administered, according to the Institution, to any of his natural Seed, as such, beyond those that did immediately proceed from his own Loyns: And so that Baptism is to be administered only upon Profession of Faith and Repentance, *our Author* knows, it is the question between us, and consequently, the bare asserting of it is *petitio principii*,

cipii, a begging the question.

Reply. But it will be said, there are several instances produced, which being compared do irrefragably prove it.

Ans. Take his instances severally, each apart by themselves, and they are but a begging the question three times over; and how we shall compare them together, so as to make any thing more of them, I know not, neither does he give us any direction to help us therein; for whereas

First, the first of his instances, as he calls them, is this, sayes he, *a carnol Parent, and a fleshly begetting by the legal birth priviledge gave right to Circumcision, whereas 'tis a spiritual begetting, by a spiritual Parent, gives only a true right to Baptism.*

Ans. To let pass the odness and uncouthness of his phrases, the thing that is asserted is this, that a natural discent from natural parents, be the parents what they would, gave right to Circumcision; whereas tis only faith & repentance as professed, give right to Baptism, which is the thing in question, and is denied by us: So for his other instances, they still amount but to this, that none ought to be baptized but the Adult, capable of personal holiness and of believing, which is still the question between us & is denied by us. But not to waste time about such trifles, could *our Author* have produced any one instance of any one who, neglecting to take hold of the Covenant, did yet convey a right to Circumcision, to his children, he had said somewhat more to the purpose: But I shall willingly refer it to the judgments of all un-

byassed

byassed persons, whether these instances do more satisfactorily prove, that Circumcision was to be administred to all *Abrahams* natural seed, than what I have said in handling the last foregoing question does prove the contrary.

For *our Authors* sixth ground, I shall only say thus much, that as Circumcision was a sign and token of the whole Covenant, as then administred; so Baptism is the sign and token of the Covenant as now administred: That is for his sixth question, his seventh shall be considered, if the Lord will, hereafter.

Now then these questions being truly stated and resolved, our Argument drawn from the Covenant for the establishment of the practice we plead for not only abides firm, but is considerably strengthened: For if so be the Covenant believers are still under be the same Covenant of Grace that was at first entred & established with *Abraham* as the Father of the faithful, & this Covenant as then entred with him did extend to & take in his natural seed immediately proceeding from his own loyns & that as such, and was continued in the same extent and latitude to all the people of God under the first Testament still extended to & taking in their natural seed immediately proceeding from their own loyns, & this not as either parents or children stood related to *Abraham* as his natural lineage & posterity, but as the immediate parents were believers themselves; (all which things we have proved) Then the Covenant must needs be continued in the same extent and latitude still, (*viz.*) as extending to and taking in children with their believing parents. And this is evident not only
from

from the utter silence of the Scriptures as to any alteration or change that God has made in the tenour of the Covenant, but from variety of scripture demonstrations that he has indeed made none; but does continue it in the same extent and latitude as formerly he did. Whence that the Covenant does still belong to the Infant-seed of believers is abundantly evident: And in as much as the Covenant does belong to them, the token of the Covenant does also belong and ought to be applyed unto them; which again appears not only from that command *Gen-17. 9.* which is still in force, and alike requires the application of Baptism the present token of the Covenant as of old it did Circumcision, the then token of the Covenant: But from the Apostle *Peters* laying interest in the promise as a sufficient ground for the application of Baptism, as also from our Lord *Christs* having appointed Baptism for the solemn admission of all those into his visible body, kingdom, and family who according to his will ought to be admitted thereinto: But these things are largely proved in that forementioned discourse whither I must refer the Reader.

For this see my
Infant-Baptism
from Heaven
from page 63
to 128.

C H A P. VI.

The Author's fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh Particulars to disprove Infant-Baptism considered; their weakness and vanity shewed, with some special Considerations to satisfy Christians about the validity of their Baptism, as administred by sprinkling or pouring Water upon the Face: The close of the whole.

Fourthly, a fourth Argument that our Author layes down for the disproof of Infant-Baptism is a supposed alteration or change made in the Ceremony of Baptism, viz. from dipping or plunging into sprinkling, or pouring a little water upon the head or face; whence he concludes it cannot be Christ's Ordinance of Baptism.

Ans. First, were it granted that such a change were made, how that should disprove the practice of Infant-Baptism, as absolutely considered, he neither attempts to, nor can shew. Nay his reasoning seems to grant, that Baptism when administred unto them by dipping is Christ's Ordinance of Baptism. For the old rule is, *veritas affirmati axiomatis est fundamentum veritatis negati*. Now to say that Baptism as administred by dipping is only Christ's Ordinance of Baptism, plainly implies that when it is so administred (as it is certain in some places, and by some

some it hath been, and still is) then it is his Ordinance of Baptism. So that as this Argument seems to grant that sometimes Infant-Baptism is Christ's Ordinance; so the utmost it can prove is, that as sometimes administered, it is none of his Ordinance; But

Secondly, That there is any such change or alteration is denied, and notwithstanding what *our Author* hath said still wants solid proof. But for this, see the preface of my Infant-baptism from Heaven, as also Mr. *Wills* his answer to Mr. *Danvers*, and others, that have largely handled this question, a question wholly distinct from that concerning the subjects of Baptism, yet I shall touch upon it by and by. Therefore to go on.

Fifthly, His fifth Argument is drawn from the variety of mischiefs, absurdities, and contradictions that he imagines may be justly charged upon the practice of Infant-baptism. And a practice justly chargeable with so many mischiefs, absurdities, and contradictions as *our Author* conceives this to be, is no ways like to be an ordinance of Christ.

Ans. In the general it may be observed, how easie a thing it is for men to imagine and cry out mischiefs, absurdities, and contradictions, and by certain artifices, as ambiguous terms and phrases, putting that for the cause which is not, &c. make them seem really such to persons of weaker capacities; whereas they are either merely imaginary, or else not at all to be charged upon the doctrine or practice opposed. Whilst themselves are guilty of no small absurdities and contradictions in framing and charging them thereupon.

This is too evident in *our Authors* case: Let us briefly view his charge in the several branches of it.

First, For the mischiefs that he supposeth Infant-baptism may be charged with; and he reckons up no fewer than ten.

First, *By it Christs order in the Commission is altered.*

Ans. That this is merely imaginary, is evident from what hath been already said, to which I must refer the Reader.

Secondly, *By it the Subjects of Baptism are changed.*

Ans. But that's the question under debate, and to beg the question and then bring in what is begged, and charge that upon the practice controverted as a mischief to disprove it self, is neither civil nor rational.

Thirdly, *By it all the holy ends of Baptism are frustrated.*

Ans. That Infants are incapable of all the ends of Baptism *our Author* himself hath not yet affirmed: Now if it be the will of our Lord Christ that it should be applyed unto them with respect unto those ends they are capable of (as I hope it sufficiently appears that it is) the application of it unto them cannot be rationally supposed to be a frustration of any; much less of all the holy ends of Baptism. It cannot be a frustration of those ends with respect unto which it is not applyed, nor can it be a frustration of those ends they are capable of, and with respect unto which it is applyed. Were all the holy ends of Circumcision frustrated as it was applyed to *Abrahams*

hams seed, because they were not capable of all those ends for which it was applyed to Abraham himself?

Fourthly, *By it the right order and manner of the administration of Baptism is altered, viz. from dipping into sprinkling, or pouring a little water upon the Head or Face.*

Ans. This we have had but just now. I shall only say, will Mr. *Danvers* bring a plain Scripture to prove that Baptism was by the Apostles administred by dipping or plunging, I shall engage to bring a plain Scripture for the Baptism of Infants: But suppose that such an inversion or change; yet it is very unreasonable for him to charge it upon Infant-baptism, he knowing full well, that that manner of baptizing was in use, though not before Infant-baptism was indeed practised, yet before he will allow it so to be; he knows who speaks of clinical Baptism.

Fifthly, *By it many errors and false doctrines have been introduced.* And he instanceth in five.

First, *That it is to take away Original Sin,*

Secondly, *To work Grace and Regeneration, and to effect Salvation by the work done.*

Thirdly, *That it is an Apostolical Tradition.*

Fourthly, *That Children have Faith, and are Disciples of Christ.*

Fifthly, *That all Children of believing parents are in the Covenant of Grace, and federally holy.*

Ans. As for his third and fifth supposed errors, they are [taking Apostolical tradition in that sense in which the Fathers and all Orthodox Divines take it] great truths. As for his three others, I shall only say that Baptism is no way

chargeable with them; neither hath our *Author* attempted to prove that it is: To charge all the errors that some have held with reference to any practice, upon the practice it self, is absurd and ridiculous: Will any be so vain as to charge the Lords Supper with all those errors that some have held about or with reference to it?

Sixthly, *By defiling and polluting the Church, and that three ways.*

First, *By bringing false matter thereinto, viz, such who are not Saints by calling.*

Ans. 'Tis no defiling the Church to admit those to whom God hath given a place in it.

Secondly, *By laying a foundation to much ignorance and prophaneness.* And

Thirdly, *To joyn them together by confounding the World and the Church.*

Ans. Our *Author* himself acquits the Practice of Infant-baptism from both these charges a little after, only let it be observed, that all Infants in Mr. *Danvers* his account are of the World. Now our Lord Christ is express, *he prays not for the World:* And how any can be saved having no benefit by the intercession of Christ; if he doth, I must profess my self not to know?

Seventhly, *By it those many humane traditions and inventions of Antichrist, it is attended with, as practised by that party, are introduced and established.*

Ans. Must every Ordinance be charged with introduction of all those humane traditions and inventions tis attended with amongst superstitious men: Alas! what ordinance then would be left to the Church.

Eighthly, Infant-baptism, by the good will of

our Author, must bear the blame of all those debates and contentions amongst men, relating to the practice of it. Yea, and

Ninthly, Of all that bitter hatred, wrath, strife, enmity and persecutions that are found among men against those that oppose it.

Ans^r. If such trivial reasonings be sufficient to disprove any doctrine or practice; not only the Christian but even all Religion in the general, that at least ingageth men to morality, would soon be cashiered out of the world. Our Author knows, such reasonings make as much against what he pleads for, as what he opposeth.

Tenthly, The last mischief our Author hath seen meet to load Infant-baptism with is, that by it the whole Antichristian interest is confirmed.

Ans^r. This is a heavy charge indeed could it be proved, but let us see what he hath said in order thereunto. And here he refers us to his preface, and he thinks he hath made it so plain that every one that runs may read it: Strange confidence! but a little to examine what hath been said, and it is this. If the very act of sprinkling or pouring water upon the head or face of the child, with the charms attending must give Grace, Regenerate, take away sin, save the soul, add to the Church, give right to all Ordinances, as Mr. Pope hath ordained? Then these two things will follow.

First, That Christs conversion, and the powerful preaching of the Gospel, his means to effect it must be slighted, ignorance and prophaneness the true interest of that state necessarily brought in,

Secondly, Hereby the nations necessarily oblige themselves by receiving his law to embrace also his doctrine.

Ans. But what if the practice of Infant-baptism do not necessitate any to ascribe any of these things to the very act however administered? And what if vastly the major part of Orthodox Pedobaptists whether Ancient or Modern do disclaim the ascribing of any of these effects unto the very act of Baptism, and on the other hand do receive and walk in the practice of it, in obedience to the law of Christ, and that looking upon it as one of his holy institutions appointed for such holy ends and purposes as Infants are capable of, what then will follow but this? That Mr. *Danvers* is one of the most unworthy and disingenious men that ever put pen to paper.

Secondly, For the absurdities he conceits may be justly charged upon that practice we plead for. And thus the

First absurdity is, *That persons may have regeneration and grace before calling.*

Ans. I judge our Author will have hard work to acquit himself of this absurdity, unless it be by running into a greater, I would only ask him whether he thinks any Infants are saved, Or whether they can be saved without regeneration? But

Secondly, Suppose this should be an absurdity, which yet it is far from; how Infant-baptism should be justly charged with it, he neither doth nor can shew.

Secondly, *That persons may be visible-Church members before conversion.*

Ans. If he had said members of the visible Church, he had shewed more ingenuity. But be they either members of the visible Church or visible

visible Church members, wherein the absurdity lies he tells us not. Its certain they sometimes were members of the visible Church; must then all the wise dispensations of God be absurd, because they sute not every mans fancy?

Thirdly, *That persons may believe, repent, be baptized and saved by the faith of another.*

Ans. But a little before Infant-baptism was charged as laying a foundation to this error, viz. that Infants have faith, here it is charged with a quite contrary absurdity. Surely it cannot be justly charged with both that error and this absurdity. But if any have been so weak as to affirm the one or the other, yet it is disingenious to charge that upon the practice it self.

Fourthly, *That types and shadows are profitable, when the antitype and substance is come, introducing thereby the legal birth-priviledg, the carnal seed, the typical holiness, the national Church, with no body knows what more, to the reviving Judaism and outing Christianity.*

Ans. Fortiter calumniare, et aliquid hærebit, seems to be one of Mr. Danvers, as well as Machiavels maxims. That the birth-priviledge of the seed of Believers which is their interest in the Covenant or federal holiness and right to the sign and token of the Covenant did either appertain to the ceremonial law, or was typical of any thing under the Gospel is insinuated, without the least shew or shadow of proof, either from Scripture, Reason, or humane Authority. Therefore let him please himself with his own fancy, only with this memento, that of every idle word, whether written or spoken; men must give an account at the day of Judgment.

Fifthly

Fifthly, *That the better to exclude Believers Baptism, new Church Covenants are invented, to enter the visible Church by, instead thereof.*

Ans. This can proceed from no other original, but either gross ignorance of his opposers principles and practices, or from meer prejudice if not something worse. Let it be proved that Baptism was appointed for the admission of persons into particular Churches, or produce the Author that hath invented such new Covenants for the end here specified by him.

Lastly, For the Contradictions *our Author* supposeth Infant-baptism may be justly charged with. And thus

First, He conceits that this practice doth contradict what the pleaders for it do assert concerning Baptism: *They assert (saith he) that Baptism is a symbol of present Regeneration wrought, and yet applyed to ignorant, unconverted babes incapable of Regeneration.*

Ans. This is no other contradiction than what might be charged upon Circumcision according to the acknowledgment of our opposers themselves. They acknowledge that Circumcision was a symbol of heart Circumcision, (see *our Author* page 223. See *Mr. Tomes* his examen page 83.) and (I suppose) by heart Circumcision they mean Regeneration; and yet Circumcision was applyed to Babes as ignorant, and as incapable of Regeneration as any Infants now are. Will they reconcile the contradiction as it respects Circumcision? And, I doubt not, they will save us a labour of reconciling it as it respects Baptism. But

Secondly,

Secondly, That this is a meer imaginary contradiction, whether it respects Circumcision or Baptism, will appear if we consider that those that affirm ~~the~~ one or the other to be a sign or symbol of present Regeneration, mean, it is so with respect to the Adult: Now I have already shewed that both Circumcision and Baptism might be appointed for different ends and uses, with reference to different persons, and yet serve to some general uses with reference to all. What contradiction is it to say that Circumcision was and Baptism is a symbol of present Regeneration actually wrought, when applied to the Adult; and yet apply the one or the other according to divine directions to Infants for those ends with reference to which it is appointed unto them: And what hath been said for the reconciling these contradictions may suffice for the reconciling his third and fourth imaginary contradictions, and as for his second I shall consider it under the sixth particular laid down for the disproof of Infant-baptism. And therefore to come to his Fifth which he thus expresseth.

5. *That the baptismal Covenant enters into the visible Church, and yet they deny to Church members the priviledges thereof, and separate from them without any warrantable cause shewed, or orderly proceeding either against them, or they that do own them as such.*

Ans. If our Author knows of any that are guilty of these contradictions, he may do well to convince them of their errours, but let not their mistake be irrationally charged upon the practice it self.

Sixthly, *That we separate from Rome as the false Church, and yet own their Baptism the foundation stone thereof: And others that pretend separation from national and parish Churches, and disown the baptizing of all good and bad with the sinful ceremonies attending it, yet if Papist or Protestant upon their own terms tender themselves to their fellowship, they are received without renouncing their sinful Baptism, and performing it in that way they judge right.*

Ans. Had our Author any solid reason to oppose our practice by, sure he would not set up such bugbears that himself knows can only scare children. But for this pretended contradiction it consists of two branches.

First, *That we separate from Rome as the false Church, and yet own their Baptism, the foundation stone thereof.*

Ans. That Infant-baptism is either Romes Baptism, or the foundation stone thereof, is (as may justly be suspected) suggested by our Author meerly to cast an *odium* upon that practice, and that contrary to his own knowledge: That any Pope, or popish council was the inventor or institutor of Infant-baptism, he hath not made so much as in the lowest degree probable, I suppose he will not have the confidence to affirm that whatever doctrine or practice hath been confirmed by any Pope or popish council is Antichristian. If he should he must by his own confession cast out the Baptism of Believers, as well as of Infants. Let this then pass for a meer calumny, without the least shew of reason for it.

Secondly, For the other branch, that concerns
not

not Infant-baptism at all as such, inasmuch as *our Author* knows full well, it is all one as to our receiving or not receiving such as he mentions, whether they were baptized in Infancy or when Adult. And therefore to divert to matters wholly excentrical to the question would be but a meer *dispendium temporis*: I shall only say, if any of those mentioned can receive no satisfaction about their Baptism will they be baptized again? supposing they will take in their Infant-seed with them, they shall not be opposed by me.

Seventhly, *Our Author* hath not yet done, he hath one thing more that he conceits a contradiction attending Infant-baptism, and that is this: *That we that plead for it do own the doctrine of perseverance, and do disown falling from Grace, and yet baptize all the Children of believers, because we conclude them to be in the Covenant of Grace, and yet teach them conversion, and in case of unbelief reject them as reprobates.*

Ans. As this proceeds from, if not wilful, yet very great ignorance, so it fully acquits us from two of those mischiefs he hath afore charged the practice of Infant-baptism with, for if we teach the seed of believers conversion, (as he speaks) and in case of unbelief reject them, how can our practice lay a foundation of ignorance and prophaneness, or how can we be said to confound the Church and the world? Can teaching Conversion be a foundation for ignorance and prophaneness? Or can the rejecting of unbelievers confound the Church and the World?

But to have done, let all men judge whether the practice we have pleaded for can be justly charged

charged with such mischiefs, absurdities, and contradictions as *our Author* hath been pleased to load it with? Or whether himself be not much more to be charged with absurdities and contradictions, and at last this mischief, that he hath unjustly reproached the good ways of God?

Sixthly, *Our Author* endeavours to disprove the practice of Infant-baptism by the supposed nullity and utter insignificancy of it. It is saith he, *no ways safe for any to rest contented with that Baptism they received in their infancy, because such their Baptism is a meer nullity and insignificant nothing in respect of the New Testament ordinance of Baptism.* And this he endeavours to make out by this reason in the general, *viz. because*, saith he, *there is that wanting in it which is so essential to true Baptism:* And he instanceth in a two fold supposed defect in Infant-baptism.

First, *There is*, saith he, *the right subject of Baptism wanting.*

Secondly, *The true external form is also wanting, as it is practised with us*

Ans. That Infants are the true and proper subjects of Baptism, hath been I hope sufficiently proved, and therefore I shall pass that, and only briefly enquire, whether to administer Baptism by sprinkling or pouring water upon the face, be such a defective manner of administration, as that it renders it a meer nullity, and insignificant nothing: So as that none may safely rest contented in their Baptism as so administered to them. Now for this I shall only offer these few things to consideration, which I desire may be duly weighed.

First,

First, That the way or manner of administering Baptism is not clearly and plainly determined in the Scriptures, neither the signification of the word, nor any of the instances left upon record of persons baptized will determine it. This is so fully demonstrated by others, in particular Mr. *Wills*, that I shall add no more for the evidencing of it. And therefore

Secondly, That as there is but a probability that Baptism was at any time administered by immersion or dipping, so there is a probability (to say no more) that sometimes it was administered by pouring or casting water with the hand upon the face of the party baptized. Thus when so great numbers were baptized together, and persons were baptized in their houses at midnight.

Thirdly, Let it be considered, that Baptism administered by pouring water upon the face, doth answer and perform the uses and ends of Baptism, as well as it doth when administered by immersion dipping or plunging. For the making out of this I shall not need to instance in all the ends and uses of Baptism, I shall take only these four,

1. The first is to represent to, and as it were set before the eyes of the mind the good contained in and conveyed by the Covenant of Grace. And hence Baptism is usually call'd a significant sign.

2. The use and end of Baptism is to seal, and confirm unto the soul its own interest in and enjoyment of that good, according to the true terms and tenour of the Covenant. And hence it is called a sealing or confirming sign.

3. The use and end of Baptism is so far to represent and hold forth the ways and means, through

through which the soul comes to have an interest in and enjoy that good, as may through the concurring light of the word and assistance of the spirit raise the mind up unto due apprehensions of, and advantage it, in the acting of its faith in and upon them; and enjoy the comfort of the good vouchsafed by and through them: These means are two fold according to a twofold kind of good contained in and conveyed by the Covenant of Grace.

The first of which is wholly extrinsecal to the soul, as the washing away the guilt of sin.

The second is intrinsecal as washing away the filth of sin, and the raising of the soul from a state of death to a state of life. The first is Christ, as having born the curse of the law, and thereby satisfying the justice and law of God in his sufferings, death, and burial, and deliverance therefrom in his resurrection and exaltation.

Secondly; The spirit, as given to or poured out upon the soul, or shed abroad (as the Apostle elsewhere speaks) in the heart. But.

Fourthly, The use and end of Baptism is to represent and oblige the soul to its duty required unto or upon its reception and enjoyment of the fore-mentioned good: And this duty in the general is to die unto sin, and live unto God. And Baptism is appointed for, and doth perform these uses and ends from a certain analogy and proportion that it bears as to the good contained in and conveyed by the Covenant of Grace, and the means through which that good is vouchsafed: So to the duty required unto or upon the souls reception of the good through those means. Now

Secondly;

Secondly, I say that Baptism as administred by pouring water upon the face, doth answer and may perform all these uses and ends as well, and as effectually as it would do if administred by plunging of the whole body into water.

For the clearing up of this I shall offer these two things.

First, That Baptism, as administred the one or the other way, doth not bear a full and adequate Analogy and proportion to all those things unto which in the performance of its ends and uses it hath reference. As for instance take Baptism as administred by immersion, it bears not a full and adequate Analogy or proportion to all the things it hath reference unto; this is evident, to instance in two things amongst others.

First, It doth not fully and adequately represent the means through which the soul comes to be washed and cleansed from the guilt of sin, the chief and principal means is the death of Christ or the shedding of his blood: Hence we are said to be *reconciled by the death of Christ*, Rom. 5. *to be washed in his blood*, Revel. 1. Now Baptism as administred by immersion, represents only his burial and resurrection. but not his death or pouring out of his blood.

Secondly, It doth not, as so administred, at all represent the means whereby the soul is washed from the filth of sin, that is the pouring of the spirit upon, or shedding him abroad into the heart of the party baptized. So that supposing (as we deny not) that baptism as administred by pouring water upon the face, doth not bear an exact and adequate proportion or analogy to all the

things, in the performance of its uses and ends, it hath reference to, no more doth it as administred by immersion.

Secondly, That Baptism, as administred by pouring water upon the face, as it doth bear such an analogy and proportion to all the things it hath reference to, as that it may through the concurring light of the word, and assistance of the spirit perform all its uses and ends as effectually as if administred by immersion, so it doth bear a more full and exact proportion to some of them, than it doth as administred the other way. This consists of two branches.

First, That Baptism, as administred by pouring water upon the face, doth bear such an analogy and proportion to all the things it hath reference unto, as that, as so administred, it may through the concurring light of the word, and assistance of the spirit, sufficiently perform all its uses and ends to the party baptized. That I may not enlarge, I shall only give two instances, about which the greatest doubt must rationally arise.

First, Baptism, as thus administred, so far represents Christ as dead, buried, and risen again, as the means through which the soul comes to enjoy all the good contained in and conveyed by the Covenant of Grace, as may raise up the mind unto him, and help the soul to act its faith upon him for that good. This will appear by these two observations.

First, That the death of Christ, the main and principal means through which the soul comes to enjoy all the good of the Covenant, is in Scripture exprest *by his pouring out his soul unto death.*

Isai.

Isai: 53. 12. So all the sufferings of Christ are expressed by this phrase, *I am poured out like water,* *Psal. 22 14.* So the death and sufferings of Christ are represented by pouring out the wine in the Lords Supper. And hence the mind being guided by the light of these Scriptures, and assisted by the spirit, may raise it self up unto due apprehensions of, and may duely act its faith upon Christ, as dead, buried, and risen again, by the sight of water poured upon the face, as well as by the sight of the parties baptized immersion or plunging into the water.

Secondly, That the burial, and resurrection of Christ are in some measure figured and represented by Baptism as administered by pouring water upon the face, as well (suppose it be not so clearly) as by Baptism administered by immersion. Theres the pouring water upon the person representing the covering of the dead body with earth, which we know is by casting and as it were by pouring earth or dust upon it, and then there is the freeing the body from the water poured upon it, or the party baptized raising himself up from under the water, somewhat representing the raising of the dead body from under the earth thrown or cast upon it in the grave: So that Baptism as administered by pouring water upon the face, doth so far represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, as may through the means aforementioned perform its uses and ends with reference to the party Baptized.

Secondly, The other instance I would give, is in Baptisms representing and engaging the soul to its duty, viz. to die to sin, and live to God in

the due exercise of Grace, and practice of holiness. And thus Baptism as administred by pouring water upon the face, may as effectually represent and engage to that duty, as though administred by immersion or plunging. This is evident from what hath been already said, for look how far Baptism as administred the one or the other way, doth represent to the mind the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, so far it doth represent and oblige the soul to endeavour after a conformity to him, in dying unto sin, and arising up to newness of life. Thus from the Analogy and proportion that Baptism bears to the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, the Apostle infers, an obligation put upon all that are baptized, by that their Baptism to die unto sin, and live unto God. Now Baptism as administred by pouring water upon the face, as it doth more fully represent the death of Christ, than as administred by immersion, so it doth though somewhat more obscurely yet also so far represent his burial and resurrection, as may effectually represent to the mind, and oblige the soul to its duty.

Secondly, For the other branch of the second particular, namely that Baptism as administred by pouring water upon the face, doth bear a more full and exact Analogy and proportion to some of the things it hath reference unto than it doth as administred by immersion. Let us instance in that one great end and use of Baptism, *viz.* to represent to the mind and thereby raise it up to due apprehensions of, and acting its faith upon the great means whereby the soul comes to be washed from the filth of sin, and raised up from a state of death

death to a state of life. This means is (as I have said) the spirit as poured out upon the soul. Now the pouring out of the spirit is more fully and plainly represented by Baptism as administered by pouring water upon the face, than as administered by plunging: This carries its own evidence along with it: From the whole of what hath been said we may evidently see, that no certain argument can be drawn from the nature, uses, and ends of Baptism, to evince the way and manner of its administration to be by immersion, inasmuch as being administered by pouring water upon the face, it doth answer and may perform all its uses and ends as really and effectually, as though administered by immersion. But let that suffice for the third consideration.

Fourthly, That which I would further offer to Consideration, is the practice of, at least vastly, the major part of the universal Church and people of God not only for the present, but for several hundred years by past. Thus the way and manner of the administration of Baptism hath been and is by sprinkling or pouring water upon the face: And here we may consider the qualifications of the persons so practising of it. They have been men as of the greatest parts and abilities, able to search into, weigh, and determine aright about the mode or manner of practices, as well as about the practices themselves, so men of the greatest sincerity acquaintance, and (as I may say) familiarity with God. Now in doubtful cases the practice of the Church of Christ ought to have its due regard: *Aut Dei testimonio aliquid esse confirmandum aut eorum qui Dei amici fuerunt, saith Plato in Timæo.*

And

And surely when we have the testimony of so many friends of God, we ought not rashly to change our practice: The Apostle takes it for granted that the custom of the Churches of God will by sincere saints be duly attended to, and therefore either to suppress that unbecoming custom among the *Corinthians*, of womens praying and prophesying unvailed, or to put an end to all those contentions that might arise or be continued about that practice, he tells them *they had no such custom, nor the Churches of God*, 1 Cor. II 16. That of *Austin* cited by *Paræus*, being duly bounded and rightly applyed, hath its weight in it, *In quibus scriptura nihil certè definit, mos populi Dei, atque instituta majorum pro lege habenda sunt*. But

Fifthly, Let the blessing that Baptism, as so administered, hath been attended with to many thousands, as also how acceptable to God and comfortable to themselves they have walked through and finisht their pilgrimages here upon earth, as only baptized that way in use among us: be seriously weighed: Of how many thousands who have only been baptized by sprinkling or pouring water up on their faces, may it be said as the Apostle saith of *Enoch*, *they had this testimony that they pleased God*, and have enjoyed the full benefit and blessing of that practice. Now when God hath evidently attended an ordinance as administered after this or that manner with a blessing and that from one age to another and manifested by variety of ways, his acceptation of such who have continued under it as so administered, we ought not rashly and without good warrant from Scripture to attempt an alteration in such a manner of administration. But

Sixthly,

Sixthly, Let it be yet considered, what hazard the administration of Baptism by immersion or plunging exposeth the administrator as well as the parties to whom it is administered, to fall under the breach of some Moral precepts, in special the sixth and seventh. It is true, were it plainly determin'd in Scripture, that baptism should be administered that way, we might expect preservation from those evils, but when the manner of administration is left absolutely undetermin'd in scripture, and consequently it is purely an indifferent thing, whether administered the one or the other way, how such preservation can be groundedly expected, concerns those, who insist so much upon that way of administration, to consider: I might yet add the incapability of many thousands who are the proper subjects of Baptism, and ought to be baptized, to receive it that way. I mean it of grown persons as well as Infants: Thus all that are converted upon dying beds and the like, now it seems wholly improbable that our Lord Christ should make that manner of administration indispensibly necessary, which would remedilessly deprive many thousands of the ordinance it self. But to come to a close by what hath been said we may see, whether there be so much as a probability that the administering of baptism by pouring water upon the face, which is the way I especially approve of, yea or by sprinkling doth render the ordinance a meer nullity and insignificant thing, and whether believers may not rest contented in their baptism so administered to them. Yet this let me add, let every one be fully perswaded in their own minds, only remembering that the manner of the administration of Baptism concerns not at all the subjects of it.

Lastly,

Lastly, *Our Author* attempts to disprove Infant-baptism by the eminent witness that hath been (as he saith) borne against it from first to last.

Ans. What heed is to be given either to Mr. *Danvers* in producing, or to the testimonies of his witnesses produced by him, hath been afore considered. I need add no more, only let me say, it cannot be judged an unequal or irrational request, if I desire both him and all others of his persuasion, that they will give a like attendance and credit to the Authors cited by himself, in what they say in favour of Infant baptism, as they will give them or any others in what they are conceived to speak against it. Now both *Austin* and *Chrysostom* (whose testimony *our Author* allows) positively assure us, that in their days Infant-baptism was the universal practice of the whole Church, and the one of them, that it had been so from the Apostol days thitherto. So *Bellarmino* (whose testimony he ought not to reject seeing it is produced by himself) saith, *the Infant-baptism is written in the books of almost all the Ancients*. The vanity of what he saith of its being an Apostolical tradition not written, because it is not written any Apostolical book, appears from what hath been already said, *that it is written in the books of almost all the Ancients*, is that *our Author* and others of his persuasion are at present desir'd to attend to. And let me add that as it is written in the books of almost all the Ancients, so *ne vult quidem* not the least word or syllable is written in any of the books of any of the Ancients in a direct opposition against it, either as disallowed by the scriptures, or introduced into the Church by men. Now would but men give attendance to, & receive that three-fold testimony with that observation added thereunto, I doubt not but they will be convinced that as Infant-baptism wants not sufficient testimony from men, so it is their chief wisdom and answerably will have their minds somewhat the more disposed to attend unto and embrace the testimony it hath from God, where he in expresse words saith, *I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee. Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou and thy seed after thee.*

1
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

